

254057

JPRS-TAC-86-059

25 JULY 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

19990422 112

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

7
81
A05

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

25 JULY 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA: U.S. Will Make Trade Concessions for Japanese SDI Role (Vsevolod Ovchinnikov; Moscow PRAVDA, 19 Apr 86).....	1
Soviet Weekly Surveys Possible SDI Countermeasures (Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, No 14, 1 Apr 86).....	3
IZVESTIYA Correspondents on European Defense Initiative (Leonid Kamynin, et al.; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 10 May 86).....	8
French Defense Minister on SDI Participation (Andre Giraud Interview; Paris LE MONDE, 27 Jun 86).....	12
French Participation in SDI Advocated (Paris LE MONDE, 6 Jun 86).....	14
SDI Seen As Necessary, by Francois de Rose	14
Defense Advantages Cited, by Georges Mesmini	15
Italy's Andreotti, Spadolini on SDI Research Participation (Rome ANSA, 26 Jun 86).....	18
Defense Chief Comments on SDI Research Contracts (London THE DAILY TELEGRAPH, 25 Jun 86).....	19

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

XINHUA on Reagan's Reaction to Soviet Proposal (Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service, 5 Jul 86).....	20
--	----

PRC Journal on Western Europe, U.S.-Soviet Rivalry (Qian Nengxin; Beijing GUOJI WENTI YANJIU, No 2, 13 Apr 86).	22
PRC People's Daily Views Soviet-U.S. Disarmament Postures (Zhang Liang; Beijing RENMIN RIBAO, 3 Jul 86).....	25
SALT/START ISSUES	
XINHUA Commentary on 'Hard Fate' of SALT II (Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service, 1 Jul 86).....	27
EUROPEAN CONFERENCES	
CSSR Foreign Minister Addresses CD in Geneva (Bratislava PRAVDA, 18 Jun 86).....	29
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS	
Moscow Commentary on U.S. Bacteriological Weapons (Moscow Television Service, 25 Jun 86).....	37
Belgium Government Compromise on Chemical Arms Viewed (Guy Duplat; Brussels LE SOIR, 6 Jun 86).....	38
NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS	
USSR Supports DPRK Call for Korean NFZ (Moscow TASS, 3, 5 Jul 86; Moscow PRAVDA, 4 Jul 86).....	40
Foreign Ministry Statement	40
Aliyev Speech	41
Official Greetings to DPRK	42
Briefs	
Venice City Council Declares Nuclear-Free Zone	43
RELATED ISSUES	
USSR: U.S. Cannot Use Arms Race To Bankrupt USSR (B. Ol'ginskiy; Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, No 14, 15, 1, 8 Apr 86).....	44
Soviet Military Journal Reviews Arms Control Policy (Moscow KOMMUNIST VOORUZHENNYKH SIL, No 4, Feb 86).....	50
USSR: UN European Regional Disarmament Conference in Tbilisi (Various sources, various dates).....	57
Significance of Conference, by V. Kornilov	57
Conference Opening	59
UN Official, Dutch Delegate Interviewed, by I. Ivanko	63

20 May Proceedings	64
U.S., UK Speakers	65
21 May Proceedings, Zhukov Interviewed	66
Local Official Sees UN Aides	69
22 May Proceedings	70
Concluding Session	71

Soviet Marshal: 'Arms Race Will Not Defeat Us'	
(Marshal Kurkotkin; Hanoi Domestic Service, 17 Jun 86).....	74

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA: U.S. WILL MAKE TRADE CONCESSIONS FOR JAPANESE SDI ROLE

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Apr 86 p 5

[Article by Vsevolod Ovchinnikov under the "Commentator's Column" rubric:
"Soybeans and SDI"]

[Text] Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone visited the United States where he held discussions with U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

This is already the fifth trip overseas by the head of the present Japanese cabinet. But this visit is special. This time the desire is to affirm the trustworthy nature of the relations between "Ron and Yasu," as the President and the Premier call each other, in connection with the forthcoming 4-6 May meeting of the leaders of the United States, Japan, FRG, France, England and Canada.

In Tokyo they look upon the talks as a rehearsal by the participants for the "big seven" meeting and for them to come to an understanding on position. Being the host once every 7 years, Japan would like them to go off smoothly. But there is a still greater interest in this to Nakasone personally. The success of the meeting would improve the position of the rightist party at the upcoming parliamentary elections in Japan and would ensure Nakasone's chances of remaining its representative and the prime minister for a third term.

During the meeting of the "big seven," Tokyo is most of all afraid of joint opposition by North America and Western Europe to Japanese trade expansion which has become generally troublesome for them. In this year alone, Japanese exports to the United States will exceed imports by 50 billion dollars. In order to muffle this sensitive issue, Nakasone has promised Reagan to reorganize the Japanese economy so that it is less oriented on export and more toward the internal market. He intends to increase American agricultural product imports, especially soybeans, and to essentially increase Japanese aid to foreign governments of strategic significance to Washington and Tokyo, in particular, to the Philippines.

From the White House point of view, the most important step toward meeting American interests would be, of course, not buying soybeans but joining in SDI, an agreement by Japan to participate in the "Star Wars" program. However, Nakasone at present is avoiding an official answer.

Americans have long known the cost of Japanese promises to equalize the trade balance. But, judging from everything, they are expressing patience in the sphere of economic opposition for Tokyo's political concessions to agree to antiSoviet rhetoric from Washington. Such a deal, as can be seen, suits both participants.

However, no deal can compensate for getting into harness with the Pentagon; Japan would become a party to the aggressive adventures of American imperialism. The rightist circles in Tokyo are taking on themselves the heavy responsibility for the dangerous results of this course in front of their own people.

12747

CSO: 5200/1379

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET WEEKLY SURVEYS POSSIBLE SDI COUNTERMEASURES

Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 14, 1 Apr 86 p 8

[Unattributed article under the "Question and Answer" rubric: "What Are Possible Countermeasures?"; first three paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] The United States is applying effort toward the creation [sozdaniye] of the antiballistic missile [ABM] system with spaced-based elements which Ronald Reagan has called the "Strategic Defense Initiative." The purpose of deploying such a system (its cost, according to preliminary estimates, will be approximately \$1.5 trillion) is to achieve strategic military superiority over the Soviet Union.

As has been announced many times, the USSR will not allow the existing balance to be upset and our response, in case SDI is deployed by the United States, will be effective and cost much less.

In ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 12 we reported on practical steps capable of bringing to naught the military superiority of a country with a "space shield." Many readers have sent letters asking for more details and which concrete measures may be taken to neutralize an ABM system with space-based elements. Returning to this subject, we are publishing excerpts from a report by the Committee of Soviet Scientists in which possible countermeasures were examined.

The main objective of countermeasures is to retain a retaliatory response which would be unacceptable to the aggressor for any nuclear attack option.

According to their characteristics these countermeasures may be active or passive. They may include both the development of special means to neutralize or destroy the various elements in the layered ABM system and increase modification and diversification of strategic nuclear weapons.

Countermeasures may also be divided according to activation time in to rapid reaction measures, which are directly associated with the retaliatory strike moment, and long-term measures, which entail prior preparations. Certain measures are already available to destroy vitally important and very vulnerable elements of a large-scale ballistic missile defense [BMD], such as:

--satellite communications;

--the command and control system where the most vulnerable links are the central control computers which, even if redundant, will be limited in number by their complexity and high cost;

--the various power supply and electrical systems.

SPECIAL MEANS OF DESTRUCTION AND NEUTRALIZATION

Possible active measures include various ground-, sea-, air- and space-based systems which use the destructive effects of kinetic energy (missiles) and lasers and other types of high energy rays. Active countermeasures are especially effective against the elements in the BMD space layer which are in orbits with known parameters for long periods of time, which significantly simplifies the task of neutralizing, suppressing or completely eliminating them.

Space battle stations in accordance with their main mission will be orientated toward destroying strategic ballistic missiles; therefore, specially developed small missiles using various basing methods may turn out to be an effective method for destroying them. Similar types already exist, for example, the American "Sprint" anti-missile missile.

A very effective active countermeasure for putting a large number of space battle stations out of commission simultaneously might be "space mines"--satellites put into orbit close to the orbits of the other side's battle stations, loaded with a sufficiently powerful charge and triggered by a command from earth.

High-powered, ground-based lasers may be used as active countermeasures. The development of such lasers is much simpler than those intended for space battle stations to destroy ballistic missiles in flight. This is explained by many factors. First, space battle stations are larger targets for destruction by laser than intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM) which makes it easier to destroy them. Second, there will be significantly fewer of these stations than their targets--ICBM's or their warheads--to be destroyed. Third, space battle stations will be visible to ground-based lasers over a long period of time.

A possible highly effective active countermeasure against battle stations might be obstacles in their orbit path created by a cloud of small objects (pellets). At a speed of 15 km/s (which is very achievable) a pellet weighing 30 grams is capable of penetrating a station's 15-cm thick steel protective screen or skin. The best targets for this type of countermeasure might be such vulnerable parts of the laser battle station as the fuel tanks, the power system and the reflecting mirrors. The dispersion of small clouds of even microscopic particles in orbit might create defects on the reflecting mirror surface which would prevent focussing the laser beam.

As concerns possible counteractions to the deployment of nuclear pumped x-ray lasers in space, it is necessary to note the following. According to one SDI concept it is suggested that they be put into orbit at the very last moment using submarine-based missiles. These submarines will have to be stationed in the world's oceans close to the borders of the USSR--in the northern part of the Indian Ocean or in the Norwegian Sea. This scheme, obviously, is vulnerable to antisubmarine warfare systems.

Detection and targeting systems in the space weapons will be highly vulnerable. The mission of "blinding" them may be accomplished by exploding a nuclear device in the upper layers of the atmosphere. Finally, traditional electronic warfare methods used against the space echelons of a large-scale ABM system are capable of making a substantial impact on its effectiveness.

It is not at all necessary to completely destroy the "space shield." It is sufficient to weaken it by attacking its most vulnerable elements and create a breach in order to retain retaliatory power which would be unacceptable to the aggressor.

STRATEGIC NUCLEAR WEAPONS DEVELOPMENTS AS A RESPONSE

Deployment of a large-scale antiballistic missile system or individual subelements of one is a violation of the 1972 Antiballistic Missile Treaty. If such a situation is created the Soviet Union can consider itself free from observing both Article XII of that treaty which bans deliberate concealment measures to impede verification by national technical means as well as the SALT II Treaty, unratified by the United States, which limits the number of ICBM's and the construction of additional launchers. Increasing the numbers of ICBM's creates many difficulties for the enemy detection system and sharply decreases the effectiveness of detection and targeting for the attack systems. Increasing the number of warheads on ballistic missiles produces a similar effect. All of this will reduce the reliability of the "space shield."

Further "saturation" of the ABM system may be achieved by additional deployments of relatively cheap, unarmed "decoy missiles" with simple control systems. Deploying decoy missiles which cannot be reliably identified by existing technical means is simple and effective from an economic point of view.

Another possible effective countermeasure might be the tactic of launching ICBM's which are intended to "exhaust" the space BMD by causing its premature activation as a result of a definitely selected order of the retaliatory attack. For example, this may be combined launches of ICBM's and "decoys," ICBM launches with wide variations in trajectories and so forth. All this leads to a great expenditure of the BMD space-layer energy sources, draws down the x-ray lasers and electromagnetic rail guns and leads to other premature losses in the BMD system fire power.

As a method of retaining the ability to adequately retaliate it is necessary to note the possible increase of the potential of those weapons for which no corresponding interception method has yet been proposed. These may include submarine-launched ballistic missiles and ballistic missiles with low

trajectories. A large part of the flight trajectory of such missiles lies within the stratosphere where the effectiveness of many of the ABM systems is sharply reduced. Another measure may be mass deployment of cruise missiles using various basic methods. Not one variant of the space weapons which have been proposed today provides for reliable detection and interception of low flying, small cruise missiles.

An effective passive countermeasure to an enemy BMD would be to reduce the burn phase of the trajectory which would make it more difficult for detection, tracking and targeting systems. This may be achieved with a relatively small expenditure connected with increasing the weight of the rocket approximately 15 percent while retaining the initial useful payload size and flight range.

Added to this group of countermeasures could be rocket launch concealment. This may be done by creating smoke screens over launch areas or using various methods to conceal a missile at the time of flight, for instance, equipping a missile with a camouflaging screen.

There are many forms to protect missiles from lasers. They may include protecting the missile body by a reflective and absorbing cover or giving it a spinning motion around its center axis which will not allow the laser beam to fix on a specific section of the body. An effective measure may be equipping the missile body with the additional cooling system or installing a moving absorbing screen on it which would move to the zone being heated. A possible countermeasure may be dispersing various materials in the atmosphere to create smoke or aerosols, that is a screen, which would absorb laser radiation.

EFFECTIVE COUNTERMEASURES

In the projects for the space layer of the large-scale BMD being discussed at the present time in the United States, the functions of detection, identification and aiming must be accomplished with the help of a broad collection of active and passive devices including optical, infrared, radar and others based on earth, in the air and in space. Since all of these items will be vulnerable to countermeasures referred to earlier, our arsenal of countermeasures can be developed against them.

One of the most effective measures of such countermeasures is various types of decoy targets. For example, accompanying the deployment of the warheads might be a cloud of chaff which not only absorb and reflect radar waves but also disperse the radar beams reflected from the warheads. A method of counteracting infrared observation and targeting is dispersing an aerosol cloud around the warheads which is an infrared radiating source. This makes it possible to conceal infrared radiation from the warheads.

The capabilities of the space BMD communications may be significantly reduced by using another side of the various types of electronic interference to suppress or distort signals.

The ability to conceal warheads inside a light multilayered balloon with a metallic reflecting film on the outside has already been referred to in many

experiments. For each balloon with a warhead inside there may be dozens of empty balloons.

The countermeasures listed here far from exhaust all of the possible ways for counteracting detection and targeting of space BMD strike weapons on ICBM's in flight.

To some SDI advocates the echelon structure of the BMD in space is sufficient to overcome the reduced effectiveness of its separate echelons. The incorrectness of such an approach is most simply illustrated by the example of destroying a part of this system such as the battle management link. Since various layers in the antiballistic missile system are linked to a common battle management system, it is obvious that countermeasures against this important structural link may lead to a sharp reduction in the effectiveness of the system as a whole.

The "space shield" is an offensive system: its use would be best only if the side possessing it were attacking first. However, as we have shown, there is a whole assortment of effective, available and much less expensive ways to retain the ability to make a retaliatory strike. The cost of the system of countermeasures may be only a few percent of the cost of the large-scale BMD with space-based elements.

12747

CSO: 5200/1379

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

IZVESTIYA CORRESPONDENTS ON EUROPEAN DEFENSE INITIATIVE

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 May 86 p 5

[Report on a telephone conference by Leonid Kamynin, deputy editor of IZVESTIYA for capitalist countries department, in editorial office; Vladimir Antonov, IZVESTIYA correspondent in Brussels; Yuriy Kovalenko, IZVESTIYA correspondent in Paris; and Yevgeniy Bovkun, IZVESTIYA correspondent in Bonn: "A Pentagon Offspring for Europe: Brussels, Paris and Bonn on the Line"]

[Text] A new concept, the "European defense initiative," has been established in the West's political lexicon. Journalists have dubbed it the "EuroSDI." What is the point? What lies behind this concept?

[Brussels] Let's go back several months to December 1985. The traditional conference of NATO's managing military organs, which graphically demonstrated NATO's intentions to continue to follow the dangerous path of whipping up the arms race, had just ended in NATO Headquarters at Evere. During the Military Planning Committee session FRG Minister of Defense M. Woerner acquainted his partners with an idea which had matured in Bonn for a so-called "European defense initiative." The minister asserted that the program's objective was to supplement Washington's "strategic defense initiative" with a certain "European version."

[Bonn] In fact, the Federal Republic most zealously took to pushing through the new militaristic project. It is true that there still are arguments about its "paternity." Some recall in this connection the speech by F.-J. Strauss at a CSU [Christian Social Union] board session last spring in which he demanded creation of a "European strategic defense initiative." Others cite a similar statement by A. (Dregger), leader of the CDU [Christian Democratic Union]/CSU fraction in the Bundestag, made at the same time. Still others refer to Minister of Defense Woerner himself, who at the aforementioned session in Brussels for the first time publicly substantiated the need for a "quality leap" to "achieve increased capabilities in ballistic missile defense". But it is absolutely clear to many that the idea was tossed from abroad, and long ago. Katrin Fuchs, SPD [Social Democratic Party of Germany] Bundestag deputy, compiled vast documentation from which it follows that the United States began speaking for the first time about creation [sozdaniye] of a special antimissile system in Western Europe even before the NATO Brussels

decision was made on "final arming," i.e., before stationing of the Pershing-2's and cruise missiles. The political objective of discussions at that time, Fuchs concludes, was to prompt the allies to subsequently adopt the "star wars" idea.

[Editorial Office] How do European adherents justify the EuroSDI concept?

[Bonn] The version of new "windows of vulnerability" which allegedly may arise in Western Europe in view of the fact that the SDI umbrella is intended first of all for the Americans, for defense against ballistic missiles, was disseminated in military circles here. People in Bonn reason that Western Europe needs its own shield to "protect itself" against medium range missiles with conventional and nuclear warheads. In other words, a military-technical makeweight to SDI is needed. Bonn not only swallowed Washington's "bait," but is even beginning to enjoy its own militaristic preparations more and more. The bulletin NATO REPORT wrote in particular in one of its last issues: "Bonn is connecting hopes for eliminating the 'nuclear gap' in its armed forces with the access to space antimissile weapons."

[Paris] One also heard such "arguments" as that the creation of the EuroSDI allegedly serves the interests of "strengthening the independence" of Western Europe and will promote a solution to its own security problems independently of the American SDI. This was to no avail, however; for example, many in Paris took a negative attitude toward the expressed proposal to create a "EuroSDI." Late last year P. Quiles, then minister of defense in the socialist government, declared in an interview with the newspaper LE MONDE that the EuroSDI will not bring additional guarantees of national security. In addition, analysts point out that this program is nothing more than an appendage or West European "affiliate" of the Washington SDI which will be controlled by the United States. Something else should be noted. French president F. Mitterand repeatedly stated that France would not take part in the American SDI. About a year ago Paris advanced the Eureka project providing for the organization of cooperation of West European countries in the area of advanced technology. But General J. Abrahamson, director of the organization for implementing SDI, repeatedly asserted the "compatibility" of SDI and "Eureka." Washington sees Eureka as a program which should be connected to the American plans for preparing "star wars."

[Editorial Office] Specifically how is it planned to accomplish the new militaristic venture?

[Brussels] The bulletin NOUVELLE ATLANTIQUE, which is close to NATO circles, wrote that the idea is to create [sozdaniye] a weapon system for destroying missiles and aircraft using military-technical means already being developed within the framework of "star wars" plans, particularly laser and electromagnetic weapons. Analysts point out that the American Patriot surface-to-air missile system present in the NATO inventory on the continent can be made the basis of Western Europe's antimissile defense after its modernization.

[Editorial Office] In short, we are speaking of drawing Western Europe into a new round of the arms race, and this at a moment when time demands ridding

mankind of the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, when a real path to this end is being laid by the Soviet Union's large-scale peace initiatives.

[Brussels] The pursuit by military-industrial monopolies of advantageous orders promising fabulous profits plays more than a minor role in implementing the very dangerous plans. The West Europeans only had to mention the intent to develop their own ballistic missile defense [BMD] system and an American corporation, LTV Aerospace and Defense Company, immediately suggested appropriate technology, which is being used in the ASAT antisatellite system. Military-industrial concerns of the FRG, England, France and certain other states of Western Europe are hastening to develop plans for participating in the American SDI and the "EuroSDI."

[Bonn] It is curious that as soon as the question of the FRG's participation in the "star wars" program was finally settled there was a public "funeral service" in Bonn for the concept of a "European defense initiative." As if on command, people ceased to use it in documents. When I recently turned to the defense ministry to find out the official viewpoint on the EuroSDI I was corrected: it is only a question of an "expanded air defense." Why was this euphemism necessary? Obviously, in order to conceal the close interrelationship between SDI and its European version. Meanwhile, realization of both projects is in full swing. Major state establishments of the FRG have joined in explorations in the area of creating [sozdaniye] space weapons. Leading military concerns have received orders for producing the corresponding components. For example, MBB, AEG-Telefunken and Siemens are collaborating in the development of a "laser tank," a tracked high-energy unit. Bonn also is placing serious reliance on modernization of the NATO Patriot air defense system, hoping to use American technology to turn it into an essential element of the "EuroSDI," as already mentioned.

[Editorial Office] It is quite obvious here that the United States is trying not only to include its NATO partners in preparation for "star wars," but also to make them accomplices in undermining the Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems.

[Brussels] U.S. pressure on NATO allies under the pretext of a need to strengthen the West European anti-ballistic missile system continues. Local analysts note that Pentagon representatives also intend to achieve their objectives at the upcoming session of the Military Planning Committee to be held in Brussels on 22 May.

[Paris] The pressure on France by its allies, and by Washington and Bonn above all, is increasing. I was informed in the press departments of the French Ministry of External Relations and Ministry of Defense that as of today there is not yet an official position with respect to the "EuroSDI." Nevertheless, even now different versions which might be the basis for a EuroSDI are being worked up. According to LE MONDE, France and the FRG are examining questions connected with creation [sozdaniye] of a joint expanded anti-ballistic missile system. By the way, analysts give the reminder that Paris is in favor of smoothing out the West European military-political integration. Strengthening of the Paris-Bonn axis is under way to this end in particular.

[Brussels] The idea of participating in creation [sozdaniye] of the EuroSDI is not yet evoking great enthusiasm among governments of the Benelux countries. In persuading his Belgian allies of the need to take part in the "European defense initiative" program, U.S. Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger wrote in an article published in the Belgian newspaper LE SOIR: "An effective antimissile defense can substantially strengthen the security of the Belgian people and protect Western Europe against the threat of Soviet missiles." A hackneyed propaganda technique! People here realize that both Washington's plans for militarization of space and implementation of the EuroSDI program pursue a common objective: to secure military supremacy and sharply strengthen the first strike potential in order to dictate one's own conditions to the world by means of nuclear blackmail. As confirmation I will quote the words of Dutch economist and Nobel Prize laureate (Jan Tinbergen), who is well-known in the scientific world:

"In my view adherents of SDI and the EuroSDI should not be hasty to implement these dangerous programs. Their consequences are unpredictable. Militarization of outer space not only would place a colossal economic burden on the peoples, but also would reinforce the threat of a nuclear conflict. It would bury all hopes for cessation of the nuclear arms race. It is still not too late to give up the project which threatens peace and mankind's very existence."

6904

CSO: 5200/1384

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRENCH DEFENSE MINISTER ON SDI PARTICIPATION

PM021220 Paris LE MONDE in French 27 Jun 86 pp 1, 14

[Interview with Defense Minister Andre Giraud by Jacques Isnard; date and place not given]

[Excerpts] [Isnard] How can France meet the technological and military challenge posed by the SDI launched in the United States in order to continue safeguarding the autonomy of its nuclear deterrent?

[Giraud] The aim of SDI is to constitute neither a technological challenge nor an alternative to nuclear deterrence. It is designed to provide a particular territory--the United States, in this instance--with as effective as possible an antimissile protection system based on methods of space detection and interception.

I believe the issue should be considered in the simplest terms. Is there a reason why American strategists should forego use of the third dimension constituted by space and neglect the development and technology that would permit an evolution there? Does France have the power--and the right--to oppose it? By virtue of what principle should we remain aloof from this new technological advance? We must not turn the technical difficulties that mankind is striving to overcoming into philosophical or political problems.

France must have a realistic and responsible attitude: It cannot remain aloof from an "irreversible trend" and French enterprises will contribute to it to the limit of their abilities and capabilities. France will not, however, allow itself to be dragged into a conflict that it has not clearly accepted. To cite the terms of the prime minister's 9 April general statement of policy: "It will not contribute its resources in advance to an organization within which it cannot exercise its sovereign decision at the appropriate moment.

[Isnard] Would you propose Europe's considering an antimissile defense--a so-called "extended" air defense system--against the nuclear missiles targeted by the Warsaw Pact on West European territory?

[Giraud] With regard to our potential aggressors' deployment of antimissile defense systems, our ambitions in the field of deterrence demand the constant improvement of our systems of penetration, which involves decoys, reentry vehicles, and the reduction of the radar equivalent surfaces [surfaces equivalents radars] of our aircraft and missiles.

In this connection corresponding technological advances apply in the shorter term to a modern antiaircraft defense, which is a necessary and accessible definite objective. It is foreseeable that France will propose to its European allies an examination of a possible joint effort in this field. Be that as it may, it must be remembered that no antimissile defense can take the place of nuclear deterrence for a long time. It will be a means of supplementing and strengthening it. It is, moreover, significant that in Washington SDI is no longer portrayed as a replacement for and therefore the end of deterrence.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2719

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRENCH PARTICIPATION IN SDI ADVOCATED

SDI Seen As Necessary

Paris LE MONDE in French 6 Jun 86 p 2

[Article by French Ambassador François de Rose: "Joint Responsibility and Independence"; the quotes in this article are excerpted from a speech delivered by Mitterrand in Coetquidam on 27 May (LE MONDE dated 29 May)]

[Text] The quarrel building up between the Elysee and Matignon concerning an eventual participation in the United States' strategic defense research effort raises once again the never resolved issue of coherence or incompatibility between our desire for independence and our policy of joint responsibility with our allies. Such a participation, declares the president of the republic, would create for us the "risk of being drawn into a conflict that we would not have clearly accepted."

To be sure, it is advisable to see to it that political imperatives rule over strategic consideration. But the real danger to our independence is viewed as coming from the Soviet Union's offensive armaments rather than from the American defense projects.

We usually seem to forget that General de Gaulle, whose authority is put forward in order to justify any decision taken in the sacrosanct name of independence, had maintained France within the detection and air defense system close to NATO (NADGE). He undoubtedly believed that the brief time elapsed between alert and reaction in the supersonic era demanded that we be informed immediately of a possible attack. With no fear, for all that, that participating in the information network integrated into the Alliance would prevent our leaders from being "in a position to take a personal part in the decision" and give to anyone other than the president of the republic a "right of life or death over France."

His successors having failed to follow his example when our allies acquired an in-depth detection system (AWACS), we would therefore be dependent upon the information which NATO would be willing to pass on to us should the Warsaw Pact Air Forces engage in suspicious movements. Whatever the reasons for this abstention, whether political or financial, the result does not conform to the spirit of the position chosen in his time by General de Gaulle, nor is it conducive to independent decisions on our part.

Whether we cooperate in an antimissile or an antiaircraft defense system makes no difference politically. All of us are threatened by the short- and middle-range missiles deployed by the USSR on its satellites' soil. Our problem is to know if a defense against these missiles is possible. And it is not by refusing to study the possibility that we will know or that we will obliterate the danger.

The future of a country's security is not judged on its respect of taboos inherited from the past, no matter how prestigious it may be, but on its forecasting future threats and warding them off.

As of this day, it is impossible to say if an antimissile defense will have effective results. But the risk of becoming automatically involved will be less the result of our participation in a defense system with our allies than of a technological development toward the robotization of operations of detection, transmission and reaction.

Those are facts of life which only the future will reveal to us. But it is not too early to be concerned with the overall problem. For if the USSR acquires such an antimissile defense and Europe is totally deprived of it, the gap between our vulnerability and the opponent's immunity would place us in the worse possible situation.

By fooling ourselves about the true threat to our independence, we run the risk of losing it completely tomorrow.

Defense Advantages Cited

Paris LE MONDE in French 6 Jun 86 p 2

[Article by Georges Mesmini, Deputy of Paris and member of the National Defense and Armed Forces Commission: "Financial Efforts and Updating"]

[Text] In a survey published in the April issue of DEFENSE NATIONALE, I analyzed, based on the official figures, the deterioration of France's military machine after 5 years of socialist power. The investigation being carried out by the Audit Office reveals that reality far exceeds any conclusion I could have reached: The very military payroll was itself no longer secured after 31 October. The accumulation of shortages, delays and abandoned projects, of which we are becoming aware today, no longer allows postponing recovery.

A determined effort to achieve a more judicious choice of equipment and a better productivity in both industries and arsenals is needed. But these measures would not be sufficient. The time has come for a sustained financial effort aimed at adjusting the military budget to the professed ambition--nuclear deterrent, significant participation in the defense of Europe and foreign action capability.

All the experts know that 4 1/2 percent of the GDP is the minimal effort level for defense sought by France for the past 25 years (the current level is 3.8 percent). It is by making once again the effort to increase, as of 1 January 1987, the annual budget by 4 percent, held between 1976 and 1981, that it will be

possible to reach the adjusted budget within a reasonable delay, that is to say, at the beginning of the next decade. Will the government which, justifiably, chose austerity, feel in a position to request this defense effort from the French? Is it prepared to go beyond the limit set by the RPR-UDF [Rally for the Republic-French Democratic Union] platform, which is totally inadequate on this point?

If responsible politicians, in both the government and Parliament, were to think they could not do so, it would then be time to adapt not the means, which are dramatically inadequate, to ambition, but ambition to means. To be sure, effectives would be the first to be reduced by pretending that defense consists of the atom, steel and electronics, but some things would very quickly have to be abandoned in the panoply of weapons. Would officials then have the courage to discuss with the French the consequence of such measures? Can the government accept the loss of certain possibilities and the decrease of our defense level and, more broadly, of our political action capability? This is how the recovery problem appears in 1986 and not otherwise.

Recovery is one thing, "renewal," which was discussed so much when the majority was the opposition, is another, equally important. The former necessitates a financial effort, the latter requires the updating of the socialists' frozen positions.

The RPR-UDF platform is very clear, involving France's relations with its allies and developments needed in doctrinal matters. Here, in particular, is what it says about the SDI: "The next government will have to begin negotiations with its European partners, West Germany and Great Britain more particularly, in order to reach a European decision with regard to participation in the Strategic Defense Initiative." The prime minister's remarks of 22 May are conform to this commitment: "It would be irresponsible to stay by the wayside, especially for a country like France which cannot dissociate itself from this important research... which, in addition, (the government) approves from a military standpoint."

This common sense position, in the face of taboos, bitterness, illusions and stubbornness is lucid and courageous; there is reason to rejoice about it. As a matter of fact, it is high time that France assesses that SDI which dominates the international strategic debate.

Let us not be wrong about the opponent: The French strategic nuclear forces--like the British--are "threatened" not by the American SDI, but by the Soviet ABM system--antiballistic missile defense--which will continue to be developed regardless of what the Americans do.

The USSR's superiority in this area and, with greater reason, its monopoly, not SDI, would create an "uncoupling" threat between Europe's and America's defense.

It is misleading to think that antimissile defense, whether based in space or on land, can be opposed: whether one wants it or not, it is in keeping with inescapable technical and technological developments. A process has been put in

motion, as the bomb over Hiroshima, which challenged the strategic context then in force, had done in its time. The full extent of the SDI consequences are undoubtedly still a long time away. Our deterrent remains therefore valuable for still many more years, but wisdom orders that we take advantage of this delay to prepare ourselves for future strategic developments.

There is no proof that SDI, accused of being selfishly aimed at an American goal, cannot be expanded to the defense against the middle-range missiles, such as the SS-20's, threatening the Old World, on condition, to be sure, that the Europeans will bring a coordinated and determined answer to the offer of participation.

Finally, SDI strongly poses the problem of Europe itself. The Anglo-American cooperation agreement was signed on 6 December 1986; the German-American agreement, on 27 March 1986. Italy is taking the same path. Europe tackles SDI in a scattered order. France is isolated. If it were to maintain its refusal, it could only block any possibility for concerted European strategic planning and any serious progress in the domain of cooperation in the matter of armament. Eureka is no way near an alternative to SDI.

Recovery and renewal of France's defense must be the keywords of the new majority.

6857
CSO: 5200/2704

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

ITALY'S ANDREOTTI, SPADOLINI ON SDI RESEARCH PARTICIPATION

AU251056 Rome ANSA in English 1036 GMT 26 Jun 86

[Text](ANSA) Rome, June 25 — Italian Foreign Minister Giulio Andreotti said that it was "in the national interest" that Italian industry and research centers participate in the United States Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI), also known as "star wars", both for defence reasons and technological progress, sources said here. Andreotti made his remarks while appearing, together with Defence Minister Giovanni Spadolini, before the Senate yesterday in a "question and answer" session on the SDI project.

Andreotti went on to say that Italian participation in the research stage of SDI does not make Italy responsible for the "political strategic implications of the initiative, given the fact that one cannot say today what the strategic implications and military impact will be since the research stage still has to be developed".

The foreign minister then pointed out that the involvement of Italian industry and research centers would "promote significant technological development in sectors of great importance such as sensors, electro-magnetism, laser power, space energy, satellite knowledge and kinetic energy".

On the other side, one must take into account that the declared objective of research is [words indistinct] "which will be efficient enough to avoid the possibility of surprise attack or an attack by error and thus reinforce stability and the conditions for security."

Andreotti told the Senate that the United States will "vigorously respect" the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, in the development of SDI, and that Italy's participation in the research stage is not the result of "external pressure" nor U.S. insistence to participate in the project.

The foreign minister then told the Senate that the government hoped to have an initial agreement with the U.S. in the next few weeks which would then lead to a definitive one as soon as possible. He also underlined that parliament would be "constantly informed" on the developments of the negotiations.

"It remains understood," Andreotti concluded, "that should there be, in the course of negotiations, the opportunity to transform the agreed upon guidelines into binding juridical commitments for the state, then the government would naturally submit these to be ratified by the proper procedure".

On his part, Spadolini recalled that Italian firms "have not only shown their interest in this cooperation, but have already presented projects, 27 of which are presently being examined by the American authorities". The Italian companies seeking to participate in SDI research include Selenia, Aeritalia, Agusta, Snia and Telettra.

/6091

CSO: 5200/2711

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

DEFENSE CHIEF COMMENTS ON SDI RESEARCH CONTRACTS

PM251554 London THE DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 25 Jun 86 p 36

[Dispatch from David Shears in Washington: "Britain Wins First Major SDI Contracts"]

[Text] Britain secured the first plum contracts for international picking from America's multi-billion-dollar Strategic Defence Initiative yesterday. Though small at 14,300,000 dollars (9,530,000 pounds) compared with American research efforts Mr George Younger, defence secretary, called them "significant." A so-called "architecture study" contract of 10 million dollars (6,660,000 pounds) to examine defending Europe against intermediate and short-range missiles, bomber and cruise missiles, goes to the Ministry of Defence. Mr Younger, who signed the contract for Britain, said: "My department will be involving a range of high-quality British contractors in the work."

The Culham laboratory at Abingdon, near Oxford, was awarded 4,300,000 dollars (1,430,000 pounds) for work in the field of particle beams. These could be used, among other things, to disrupt enemy electronics and detonate explosives and propellants in space.

While Mr Younger said after his talks with Mr Caspar Weinberger at the Pentagon that he agreed with the American defence secretary that "our co-operation in this field is going to be a success," he nevertheless voiced reservations about the whole SDI concept. While he pointedly reaffirmed Britain's adherence to the four points agreed between Mrs Thatcher and President Reagan at Camp David in December 1984, Mr Younger pointed out that it was research, not deployment, that had been agreed on.

The most important of the points agreed by prime minister and president, namely that any deployment of space defences would have to be a matter of negotiations because of treaty obligations, had been blithely ignored by Mr Weinberger in his remarks to a space symposium in Washington earlier. At that meeting the American defence secretary had said that nothing should be allowed to hamper either research or deployment of SDI systems.

In his subsequent speech, Mr Younger said that NATO allies agreed that, regardless of the outcome of SDI research, "for the foreseeable future Western security will continue to depend upon the maintenance of nuclear deterrent forces." In other words, he was saying that the alliance did not share the optimism of Mr Reagan and Dr Weinberger that SDI could make nuclear offensive weapons obsolete. Mr Younger, pleaded for more consultation between America and her allies. European capitals are becoming increasingly worried by America's tendency to spring surprises, such as the issue of overthrowing the SALT 2 arms treaty constraints, he said. There was no divergence between America and Europe on "the aims" of arms control, said Mr Younger. But without sufficient consultation there was "ample scope for Soviet wedge-driving in the alliance."

/8309

CSO: 5240/56

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

XINHUA ON REAGAN'S REACTION TO SOVIET PROPOSAL

OW081124 Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service in Chinese 1326 GMT 5 Jul 86

[Text] Beijing, 5 Jul (XINHUA) -- Commentary by XINHUA reporter Mei Zhenmin: Reagan's reaction to Soviet new proposal

Recently, U.S. President Reagan made a noticeably positive reaction to the Soviet Union's new proposal on disarmament.

Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 16 June put forward an "interim proposal" calling for "a limit on the United States' Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] to the experimental level" and for both sides to "adhere to the SALT II nuclear arms control treaty for another 15 years." He also advocates "limiting the strategic nuclear arsenals of both nations to their current levels." The "interim proposal" lists the aforesaid points side by side, and has not set the first two points as a prerequisite to the last point. U.S. President Reagan praised the proposal as Soviet Union's "beginning of a serious effort" that "could represent" "a turning point" in arms talks and "an opportunity for improving the relations between the two nations." He said that he accepts it "in principle."

Reagan's reaction was positive because the "interim proposal" indeed shows some relaxation and is closer to U.S. demand. It is also because of the following two reasons:

Since the beginning of this year, the Reagan administration has rejected one Soviet disarmament proposal after another. Recently, it announced that it will no longer be bound by the SALT II treaty after the end of this year. In addition, it has put forward a "limited retroactive strategy [youxian tuihui zhanlue 2589 7098 2236 0932 2069 3970]" and launched two raids on Libya which has close relations with the Soviet Union. All of these have again strained U.S.-Soviet relations which has just been relaxed a little. Reagan has his own strategic consideration and attempts to hold in check Soviet Union's "acceleration strategy [jiasu zhanlue 0502 6643 2069 3970]," but his strategy has caused serious anxieties and worries among the U.S. public and its Western European allies. At the recent NATO foreign ministers conference, the allies were unanimously opposed to U.S. abolition of the SALT II treaty. Most U.S. Congressmen also openly oppose the abolition. The U.S. House of Representatives specifically adopted a resolution calling on the Reagan administration to continue to abide by the treaty. A public

opinion poll on 25 June showed that more than 60 percent of the American people are opposed to some foreign policies of the Reagan administration. As the mid-term election in November draws near, President Reagan must consider the sentiments of the American people and the aspirations of the Western European allies.

2. In the United States, the voices objecting to the "star wars" program has become louder, creating more resistance to this program of the Reagan administration. On 13 May some 6,500 scientists, engineers, and technicians issued a pledge not to take part in the "star wars" program and criticized the program as a "dangerous assumption." On 19 June some 1,600 scientists working with upper-level agencies of the Reagan administration and industrial laboratories (many of them are taking part in the "star wars" program) jointly wrote Congress a letter regarding the program as "unfeasible in the foreseeable future" and as "seriously endangering existing arms control treaties and future talks."

Under the impact of such surging opposition, the U.S. Congress' enthusiasm for the "star wars" plan is also diminishing. Forty-six senators have written a joint letter to the Reagan administration, demanding a drastic reduction of the proposed spending on "star wars" research. When the Senate and the House deliberated and approved the federal government's budget for fiscal 1987, they cut a considerable amount from the expenditure proposed by the Reagan administration for research on the "star wars" plan. Recently, there has been a rumor that the United States will gradually end the "star wars" plan, although this cannot be regarded as true because President Reagan, who considers it his "trump card," will not give it up easily. It seems, however, that because many factors are involved, he may have to slow down the pace of implementing the plan. This may have influenced the Reagan administration's attitude on the question of arms control.

While responding positively to the above Soviet proposal, President Reagan has indicated many times that he hopes that the second summit between the leaders of the two countries can be held within this year. On 3 July, he told USA TODAY reporters: The Soviet Union's recent proposals on weapons control, regional conflicts, human rights, immigration, and other issues "made me optimistic. We will not only hold a summit meeting with the Soviet Union, but I feel the meeting may reach agreements on some identical objectives."

Whether the events mentioned above will lead to an earnest U.S.-Soviet disarmament agreement needs further observation.

/12858

CSO: 5200/4053

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRC JOURNAL ON WESTERN EUROPE, U.S.-SOVIET RIVALRY

HK010101 Beijing GUOJI WENTI YANJIU in Chinese No 2, 13 Apr 86 pp 27-32

[Article by Qian Nengxin: "Position and Role of Western Europe in U.S.-Soviet Rivalry"--first paragraph printed in boldface]

[Excerpt]Both the United States and the Soviet Union take the control of Europe as the final goal of their contention on this continent. Fundamentally speaking, the contradictions between Western Europe on one side and the United States and the Soviet Union on the other can never be eliminated. Under the new situation where the United States and the Soviet Union have entered into dialogue while continuing the confrontation, a basic policy that Western Europe may possibly adopt to deal with the situation is to further expedite the relaxation of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union as well as relations between East and West, to do its best to restrain the development of the U.S.-Soviet arms race, and to exercise its independent and positive role in this effort. In the future, the position and role of Western Europe will be determined by the strengthening of its power and the progress of the alliance of various countries. Judging from the trend of historical development, Western Europe, which is a pole in the multipolar world, will further play a positive role in opposing the arms race and preserving world peace.

Since World War II, Europe has been the cockpit of the contention between the two superpowers. Over the past 60 years or so having gone through several stages of cold war, detente, and intense confrontation, the European situation has changed a great deal. After the Reagan administration proposed the Strategic Defense Initiative, the United States and the Soviet Union readjusted their respective tactics, and since then, both sides have been in a period of dialogue and confrontation. In this new situation, Western Europe is in a very delicate and complicated position. Now its greatest problem is how to readjust its relations with the United States and the Soviet Union in light of the situation in order to seek security and interests for itself and to exercise its specific role.

1. The Question of Security

The question of security has always been the most important one in the relationship between Western Europe on one side and the United States and the Soviet Union on the other.

Since the Reagan administration proposed the Strategic Defense Initiative the following new characteristics have appeared in U.S.-Soviet relations:

1. The arms race between the sides has been upgraded. Apart from all kinds of nuclear weapons and conventional weapons, the United States and the Soviet Union have stressed the development of outer space weapons in their contention for military superiority. There are indications that this contention will last for a long time (about 10 to 20 years or even longer) and consume large sums of money and will of course greatly alter the military strategy and tactical ideology of both sides.

2. An unprecedented peace offensive has appeared. At the beginning of this year, to counter the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative, the Soviet Union put forth a disarmament proposal on complete destruction of nuclear weapons throughout the world in three stages over the next 15 years.

This is the first overall and systematic nuclear disarmament proposal the Soviet Union has made for many years. Later the United States made a counterproposal. The possible development of the disarmament talks between the United States and the Soviet Union in various spheres, which is an auxiliary measure for the arms race, will inevitably have a bearing on the international situation as a whole, and Europe is the first to be affected.

Western Europe is very worried about the new round of the arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union. Mindful of its own interests, Western Europe hopes that a strategic balance between the military strength of both countries can be attained at a lower level. Only thus can it have more room for maneuver between the two countries, increase the safety coefficient, and strengthen its independent position. The Reagan administration intends to act in accordance with its existing policies in the outer space arms race. But the Soviet Union will not be content to fall behind. While raising obstacles for the United States, it has also adopted and will continue to adopt relevant countermeasures. Therefore, Western Europe is unable to stay aloof from the matter. At present, in response to U.S. demands, some West European countries have, in varying degrees, joined the Strategic Defense Initiative (in order to deal with the United States and to gain substantial benefits). However, this does not mean that Western Europe is following the United States and has joined the outer space arms race. In the future, in the course of studying, producing on a trial basis, and deploying U.S. outer space weapons, the basic conflict of interests between Western Europe and the United States will certainly become more and more obvious. Moreover, with the upgrading of the U.S.-Soviet arms race, Western Europe will certainly develop and enhance its defense force in order to preserve its own safety and position. Thus, the contradictions between Western Europe and the United States, and the Soviet Union, the contradictions among various West European countries, and the contradictions within West European countries will naturally be aggravated.

Western Europe is also apprehensive of the possible changes in NATO military strategy. Since a "balance in nuclear terror" between the United States and the Soviet Union was achieved, Western Europe has been relatively safe on the question of defense. Although for many years, it has had various doubts about NATO's "flexible reaction strategy," chiefly for fear that the U.S. military protection will become more and more unreliable with the strengthening of the Soviet military force and changes in the relative strengths of the United States and the Soviet Union, there have been no substantial changes in its basic position. However, after the United States proposed the Strategic

Defense Initiative it immediately felt that once the United States realizes its plan and gains the initiative in both strategic offense and defense, the "flexible reaction strategy" will inevitably collapse. Then, Western Europe could be in a difficult position. It will have to either rely on the United States to a greater extent and lose its original position or "disengage" from the U.S. defense and be faced with the great military pressure of the Soviet Union. Although all this will not happen at present or in the near future, people in West European political and military circles have yet to take precautions.

Western Europe is full of misgivings about the USSR peace offensive and the U.S.-Soviet disarmament talks. The resumption of the U.S.-Soviet talks has relaxed relations between East and West. This conforms to the interests of Western Europe and is welcomed by it. However, on some essential problems such as how the U.S.-Soviet disarmament talks will develop and what kind of agreement should be reached, Western Europe is full of misgivings. Judging by its own experience, it is extremely apprehensive that the two superpowers may reach an agreement that will harm the interests of their respective allies in order to satisfy their own needs.

On the question of reducing the strategic nuclear weapons of both sides and reducing their conventional armed forces in Eastern and Western Europe, there also exist similar sensitive spheres concerning the immediate interests of Western Europe. Toward the disarmament proposal for the Soviet Union on complete destruction of nuclear weapons, in principle, Western Europe feels it unsuitable to oppose it, but it is clear about the Soviet Union's real purpose -- that is, to break up relations between Europe and the United States and to restructure the development of Western Europe's defense force. In particular, concerning the Soviet proposal on freezing the French and British nuclear forces in the next 5 years, while both the United States and the Soviet Union are still in possession of large quantities of nuclear weapons, Britain and France feel unable to accept this under any circumstances.

For many years, a basic West European policy on the matter of defense has been "defense plus detente means security." No substantial changes in this policy are likely now or in the future. In the immediate postwar period, Western Europe relied entirely on the United States in the matter of defense. Beginning from the 1960's, with the increase of its own strength, a proposition on "two pillars" was raised within NATO but in face of the powerful military strength of the Soviet Union, it still cannot dispense with U.S. "nuclear protection." Therefore, in seeking the most favorable "point of balance" for its own security, Western Europe has continued to adopt the following three policies: Maintaining U.S. military protection, developing its own defense force within certain limits, and ameliorating confrontations between the United States and the Soviet Union as well as between the two large military groups of East and West. This reflects the important and sensitive military position of Western Europe and also exposes its weakness. The recent development of the so-called "new de Gaulism" is an expression of how Western Europe is seeking to increase its strength and independence. The restoration of the West European alliance and the strengthening of military cooperation in Western Europe also reflect this trend. Despite all this, the current effort of Western Europe in this respect still cannot cope with the new situation of the U.S.-Soviet contention. How it will improve its situation remains to be seen.

/8309

CSO: 5200/4051

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRC PEOPLE'S DAILY VIEWS SOVIET-U.S. DISARMAMENT POSTURES

HK030853 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 3 Jul 86 p 3

["News Analysis" by Zhang Liang: "New Soviet-U.S. Postures on the Disarmament Issue"]

[Text] The fifth round of U.S.-Soviet arms control talks in Geneva concluded on 20 June. As with the previous rounds, this 50-day round of talks made no progress. However, around the time the talks concluded, the postures adopted by the United States and the Soviet Union on the nuclear disarmament issue attracted attention. During the talks, the Soviet representative put forward to the U.S. side a so-called "intermediate plan" on disarmament, which was openly welcomed by President Reagan. He expressed the hope that this Soviet move showed that the Soviet Union "has started to make serious efforts" in disarmament, and that this would mark a "turning point" in the arms control talks. Outside opinion holds that this new posture adopted by the two sides is something rarely seen since their summit meeting last November, but it is still too early to say that the U.S.-Soviet disarmament talks have yielded some result, since there are still many differences between them to be resolved. The following are the main contents of the proposal: 1) The Soviet Union proposes that the United States and the Soviet Union should not withdraw from the "treaty limiting antimissile missile defense systems" in the next 15 years," and that work in the field of the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" be limited to laboratory research, that is, to the level that the United States has already reached. 2) The offensive strategic weapons of the two sides, that is, land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine-fired missiles, and heavy bombers, should be limited to the level of parity, and the two sides should each reduce the numbers of carrier vehicles to 1,600 and warheads to 8,000. 3) The question of medium-range nuclear weapons capable of hitting the Soviet Union or the United States should be resolved separately from the above-mentioned three-in-one strategic weapons.

The media generally hold that the Soviet Union's new "intermediate plan" is more flexible in certain respects compared with previous Soviet disarmament proposals. In the past the Soviet Union has consistently opposed the U.S. "star wars" scheme (that is, Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative) and has regarded U.S. scrapping of this scheme as a precondition for reaching an agreement on reducing strategic nuclear weapons. This time, however, the Soviet Union says that "star wars" scheme research can be limited to the level of laboratory research. In addition, the new proposal no longer insists on counting as strategic weapons medium-range missiles and bombers deployed by the United States in Europe and on aircraft carriers, but instead suggests that reductions should first be carried out in long-range missiles and bombers. However, it is evident from the plan that the Soviet Union is emphasizing that the two sides must undertake their obligations and must not withdraw from the treaty on antimissile missiles for at least 15 years, thus limiting U.S. development of strategic defensive weapons.

This new Soviet proposal was put forward not longer after President Reagan announced his decision on no longer adhering to SALT-II. Western public opinion felt that this proposal was "unexpected," and also analyzed the Soviet move as possibly being based on the following consideration: If SALT-II is indeed scrapped, the 1972 U.S.-Soviet treaty directed against antimissile missiles will also be in danger of disintegration; and so the Soviet Union produced this new plan in order to maintain the process of the U.S.-Soviet arms control talks and also to limit the U.S. "star wars" scheme as far as possible. In this way the Soviet Union could demonstrate its flexibility before world opinion and would also be able to buy time to maintain strategiv party with the United States.

The U.S. response to the new Soviet proposal has also exceeded expectations to some extent. There are also reasons for the relatively positive U.S. response. First, certain aspects of the new Soviet proposal are in accord with U.S. thinking, because the United States has consistently demanded that reduction of strategic weapons cannot be directly linked to the strategic defense scheme, and the two should be resolved separately. The United States also holds that the research work on the strategic defense scheme does not violate the antimissile treaty. Second, since the Reagan administration announced at the end of May its decision to no longer adhere to SALT-II, it has come under strong domestic and international pressure, since its Western allies and the majority of congressmen have urged the administration to change its mind and continue to adhere to the treaty. Some people in the West therefore hold that in expressing appreciation "beyond expectation" for the new Soviet proposal, the Reagan administration is acting partly to extricate itself from a passive position and to keep up the momentum of talks and dialogue with the Soviet Union. Doing this is useful for continuing to bargain with the Soviet Union in the talks, without going so far as to cause domestic discontent when the U.S. congressional mid-term elections are imminent. It can also reassure its West European allies in this fashion.

However, a good deal of public opinion holds that the recent mutual posturing of the United States and the Soviet Union on the disarmament issue only represents a lightening of the atmosphere, and there is no clear intention on the part of the two sides for reaching any kind of disarmament agreement, and it appears that they are "sharing a bed but dreaming different dreams," with each devising its own schemes. The new Soviet proposal focuses on reducing strategic nuclear weapons in exchange for no U.S. withdrawal from the antimissile missile treaty for at least 15 years, while also setting restrictions on the U.S. "star wars" scheme. And in its response, the Reagan administration stressed that the new Soviet proposal "is unacceptable without amendments." It appears that the U.S. "star wars" scheme remains the crux of the argument between the two sides. As for how to reduce strategic nuclear weapons when the two sides have different kinds of weapons and in different strengths, and each side is superior in different respects, this remains a hot potato.

The well-known American commentator Hersh recently published an article in the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR which drew a vivid analogy: The first big door blocking serious talks between Moscow and Washington has been opened, and Reagan naturally wants to go into the room to see what is there. However, before entering the room, there are still many doors that are still unopened along the long corridor of the disarmament talks.

/8309

CSO: 5200/4051

SALT/START ISSUES

XINHUA COMMENTARY ON 'HARD FATE' OF SALT II

OWO41352 Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service in Chinese 1031 GMT 1 Jul 86

[Text] Beijing, 1 Jul (XINHUA) -- Commentary: The Hard Fate of the "Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty," by XINHUA Commentator Peng Di

The second U.S.-Soviet Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty [SALT II Treaty] has had a hard fate indeed. It went through 7 difficult years before coming into being. Seven years after its birth, the congresses of the two countries have not ratified the treaty to accord it legal recognition. Now President Reagan has announced that the United States will no longer be bound by the treaty at the end of this year. If the treaty had any golden period to speak of, that was 18 June 1979, the day it was signed in Vienna. I was there and witnessed President Carter and General Secretary Brezhnev embrace and congratulate each other on the treaty's birth. At that time, the two leaders spoke highly of the treaty. In their informal talks or comments after the meeting, ranking U.S. Government officials even considered this a breakthrough signaling an improvement in U.S.-Soviet relations.

Unfortunately, shortly after the signing of the treaty, 100,000 Soviet troops invaded Afghanistan, a nonaligned nation, in December that same year. The world was shocked, and U.S.-Soviet relations took a sharp turn downward. The Carter administration immediately announced a blockade in the Persian Gulf and warned the Soviet Union against moving south. The U.S. Congress categorically refused to ratify the newly signed treaty, which had been very controversial in the United States. The treaty was thus shelved.

However, based on their own considerations and needs, the United States and the Soviet Union did not abolish the treaty right away. They considered the treaty's stipulations worth observing for the time being. Since then the treaty has behaved like a ghost, appearing and disappearing now and then. No one cared about it even when it expired at the end of 1985. President Reagan recently brought up this subject, thereby reminding the people of the presence of this thing which looks like a treaty but not is a treaty, and which may or may not be observed.

Actually, there is nothing to lament about the fate of this treaty. It was supposed to temporarily play the role of a regulator in a trial of strategic strength between the United States and the Soviet Union. Each was trying to use this treaty to consolidate its own position in the nuclear arms race and to restrict the other.

This treaty allowed tremendous room for growth for both sides in terms of the quantity of strategic weapons. In terms of quality, each side could take into consideration the characteristics of its own weapons, exploit its strengths and circumvent its weaknesses, and actually increase the quantity under the pretext of arms reduction. Take the missiles with multiple warheads that can be independently targeted, for instance. When the treaty was signed in June 1979, the United States and the Soviet Union respectively had 1046 and 752 delivery vehicles with these multiple warheads. However, the treaty stipulated that both sides could increase their holdings to 1320 delivery vehicles. Arms expansion was carried out under the name of arms limitation. True enough, since then, both sides have speeded up the race in this area. It is little wonder that by early 1986, the United States had increased its nuclear warheads from 9,200 to 11,000 delivery vehicles, while the Soviet Union had increased its warheads at a much faster rate, from 5,000 to about 10,000 delivery vehicles. Each has developed or deployed other new-generation weapons for use on the ground, under the sea, and in space while accusing the other of violating the treaty.

Obviously whether the treaty was valid or whether or not it had expired will not stop the U.S. -Soviet arms race. President Reagan was very straightforward and opposed this treaty from the very beginning. On the surface, the reason was that this treaty was not for reducing arms, and that everything should start anew if serious arms reduction is desired. The underlying reason was that he could not tolerate the Soviet superiority in some strategic weapons, and was thus determined to compete with the Soviet Union in these areas.

In arms expansion, the Soviet approach has always been more action, less words, or no words at all. It has worked hard to develop offensive and defensive weapons, and its words do not match its deeds. Since the new leadership of Gorbachev came into office, the Soviet Union has offered some disarmament proposals to the United States. Recently, while criticizing Reagan for not observing the SALT II Treaty, the Soviet Union again offered a new proposal, urging the United States to continue to honor in the next 10 to 15 years the "Antiballistic Missile Treaty" signed by both sides in Moscow in 1972. In this connection, the Soviet Union is willing to reduce strategic offensive weapons "on a par" with the United States. Apparently this proposal is still aimed at U.S. "star wars" program.

It is common sense that a treaty is better than an unrestrained arms race. However, both sides should be sincere. If the United States and the Soviet Union really care about the world's public opinion and international peace and refrain from constantly strengthening their position and pursuing an outward expansionist policy, then this treaty will naturally serve as a new starting point for discussing new steps for further arms reduction.

In this way, this pitiable treaty may be prevented from total abandonment, and may play a limited role instead of being left in ruins.

This is only a wish of the ordinary people. The treaty's destiny is actually held in the hands of the policy-makers in Washington and Moscow.

/8309

CSO: 5200/4052

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

CSSR FOREIGN MINISTER ADDRESSES CD IN GENEVA

AU230601 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 18 Jun 86 p 7

[Report on speech delivered by Foreign Minister Bohuslav Chnoupek at the disarmament conference in Geneva on 17 June: "To Guarantee Mankind's Safe Development"]

[Text] Geneva (CTK)--Bohuslav Chnoupek, CSSR minister of foreign affairs, spoke at yesterday's session of the Disarmament Conference in Geneva. In his speech he expressed thanks for the friendly welcome and satisfaction at having the opportunity to make an appearance at the forum of this body, in which representatives of 40 states from all over the world are discussing the possibilities pertaining to concluding a disarmament agreement, particularly in the sphere of nuclear and chemical weapons, an agreement banning nuclear tests, and an agreement on averting the militarization of space.

B. Chnoupek recalled that in the past 24 years of the existence of the Disarmament Conference, Czechoslovakia--which has been a member from the outset--has been supporting it. The CSSR minister of foreign affairs said further:

The importance of the conference has increased, especially at present. In a period of generally grave alarm over the strained international situation, when the world is undergoing a period of radical transformation, the urgent issue of its further fate appears in a totally new light and requires new thinking. In this period the problem is clearly defined: whether the policy of common sense will prevail over the policy of strength, or whether weapons will prevail over policy in general.

Therefore the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states stressed with justification last week in Budapest that today no single state or group of states can build their security and happiness on dictating their will with the help of military strength to other countries and nations.

Yes, halting the feverish arms buildup, passing to concrete measures in disarmament, overcoming the trend toward the growing danger of war, returning international relations to detente--these are the most sensible solutions of the situation.

In complete harmony with these objectives are the programs of totally scrapping nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction by the end of this millenium;

preserving peace in outer space; planning a comprehensive system of international security on totally new political, economic, legal, humanitarian, and ethical foundations; adopting unilateral moratoria on all nuclear explosions; making balanced proposals for a complete scrapping of intermediate-range missiles in Europe; proposing new initiatives aimed at banning chemical weapons, or providing constructive stimuli for reducing armed forces and conventional equipment.

Completely at odds with these sensible solutions are the stimulation of a feverish arms buildup; the intensification of tests of new generations of nuclear weapons; the plan to dismantle the SALT treaty on limiting strategic weapons; the continuing deployment of new intermediate-range missiles in Western Europe; the acceleration of the preparations for the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative and its European alternative, or the decision to modernize NATO's chemical arsenals.

In this situation of conflict, we consider it our duty to continue persistently to search for and investigate possibilities of how to rid mankind of the threat of war.

In so doing, we proceed from the fundamental principles of our foreign policy, which is based on peaceful coexistence and cooperation; from the bitter experience of our state, which was hit by almost all hurricanes of European combat; from the proven finding that not many of the world's regions are as sensitive to the growth of tension as our continent, on which two catastrophic world wars broke out during the lifetime of present-day generations; and also from the bitter reality that precisely we are situated on a line on which are located two huge groupings of troops and equipment, the largest known to civilization. Therefore we know very well the value of peace. Therefore we want to keep on contributing to peaceful coexistence and good relations among states with different social systems, as it is written in our Constitution.

For this reason, our policy vis-a-vis the Geneva talks has always been guided by the requirement of effectiveness: that urgent issues be resolved and not postponed, that talks overcome existing obstacles and forestall new ones, that they aim directly, without roundabout paths, at effective measures for universally and totally scrapping nuclear weapons.

Today, this demand is magnified by the fact that even parity is ceasing to be a factor of military-political containment. Therefore this demand corresponds to the reality of the nuclear space epoch.

Therefore we are in favor of opening concrete talks on all aspects of banning nuclear weapons tests. Such a ban would constitute a marked obstacle to their further perfection and would create a much more favorable atmosphere for their scrapping. In the interest of rapidly concluding an appropriate treaty, we consider it proper that this conference decides about setting up a working body with a corresponding mandate. We support the endeavor of the conference to create a system of international exchange of seismic data. We value the accord of Soviet and American scientists on a mutual exchange of monitoring stations on the territories of the two states.

On the other hand we do not think that it is necessary to wait until nuclear weapons are eliminated. And we ask ourselves: Are not these continuing tests--allegedly necessary for maintaining the credibility and reliability of the nuclear potential--actually necessary for a planned first strike?

The examples at hand show how to proceed, above all the unprecedented unilateral moratorium--not an easy proclamation for the Soviet Union from the viewpoint of its own security and that of its allies--this simplest, cheapest, and from all viewpoints most effective way of halting the nuclear race; the Soviet Union's willingness to resolve flexibly all problems connected with the elaboration of a treaty banning test; the work already done by the Geneva Conference in this respect; and also the world public's "no!" to the tests at the test range in Nevada.

Today, in our opinion, the endeavor aimed at banning nuclear tests, at the complete elimination of the nuclear threat, also concerns the task of guaranteeing the safe development of nuclear power engineering. One cannot speak in the same breath about concern regarding failures of peaceful energy reactors and at the same time plan a much greater destruction with nuclear weapons. The safety of nuclear power plants can be increased, of course, through technical and political means, in the first place by setting up an international regime for the safe development of nuclear power engineering, as proposed by the Soviet Union on 14 May of this year, a safety system which would become a universal international obligation of each state individually and of all states together. It would guarantee the highest technological standards and, at the same time, forestall possible political conflicts and tensions among states. We in Czechoslovakia fully support this project. We see in it a prudent and responsible approach.

Regarding issues of nuclear safety we also draw on our own experience. A concrete example here is our 1982 agreement with neighboring Austria on issues of common interest connected with nuclear facilities. This truly unique document, signed for the first time between states with different social systems, is evidence that nuclear safety problems can also be positively resolved, regardless of the political and economic systems of the states involved. Its implementation, particularly following the Chernobyl accident, has contributed to the strengthening of mutual trust in our region.

And now permit me to direct attention to a very important moment in current international developments which elicits our--and not only our--alarm. I have in mind the plans of the American side to back away from its commitments arising from the SALT treaties. We assess them as steps obviously aimed at undermining equilibrium, eliciting sharp retaliatory measures, and devaluing the positive aspects of the Geneva meeting, whose promises remain unfulfilled to this day. We are in favor of strengthening the treaty on the limitation of anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, which in its time was also praised by the Soviet Union's co-signatories as a "real milestone."

In the creation of offensive space weapons and the enlistment of further states for the "STAR WARS" program, we see great peril for the disarmament process. The result of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative or its European offshoot can only be general destabilization, insecurity, and incalculable risks.

Therefore we favor with all determination the adoption of a disarmament program, in which a total scrapping of nuclear weapons is organically linked with measures aimed at the nonmilitarization of outer space, that is, a program whose basic outlines were proposed by the Soviet Union on 15 January of this year.

As the first realistic step toward reducing the danger of a space arms buildup, we favor working out an agreement on the immunity of space facilities and on banning and destroying antimissile systems.

We are joining the plan aimed at creating a firm material, political, and organizational foundation for "Star Peace" in the spirit of the three-stage program of joint steps proposed by the Soviet Union on 2 June of this year.

At their summit held in Budapest last week, the member-states of the Warsaw Pact, guided by the endeavor to achieve a radical turn for the better in the current complex international situation, collectively adopted important measures, constituting a further step in their comprehensive approach toward the solution of disarmament problems, that, is in addition to the scrapping of nuclear weapons, to begin substantially reducing armed forces and conventional equipment.

In the Budapest Appeal we proposed such a reduction to all European countries, the United States, and Canada. It would apply to the entire European territory--from the Atlantic to the Urals, with the idea that the first step in the course of 1 or 2 years could be the reduction of the armed forces of NATO and the Warsaw Pact by 100,000 to 150,000 men on each side. We favored making the subject of the reduction of all components of the ground forces and the tactical offensive air forces, as well as the nuclear weapons of operational-tactical designation with a range of up to 1,000 km. We expressed the willingness to carry out a further considerable reduction provided there is assent on the part of the NATO states, with the objective that at the beginning of the next decade the reduction by each side would exceed half a million troops compared with the present-day situation. We proposed that the reduced troops be mobilized, and that the best thing would be to reduce their equipment and technology or, if possible, to divert them for peaceful purposes. In this connection we submitted a package of additional proposals aimed at reducing the risk of unexpected attack, and at strengthening the trust and the national and international verification procedures. We affirmed the willingness to discuss such reduction at any jointly agreed upon forum: within the framework of the second stage of the conference on confidence-building measures and security and disarmament in Europe, expanded Vienna talks, or even by convoking a new special forum. We submitted these proposals without any preconditions so that talks could begin without delay. At the same time we solemnly declared that the Warsaw Pact member-states will never under any circumstances launch military actions against any state, be it in Europe or in another part of the world, provided that they themselves do not become victims of aggression.

Thus we have before us a broadly worked out, carefully weighed, indubitably significant program for far-reaching conventional disarmament.

Therefore it would only be a waste of time to speculate, as is usually the case, what propagandist background it has, whether it is tactics or diplomacy, as is

sometimes done. And instead of the usual searching for "weak spots"--whether its encompassing Europe is to the advantage of one and the disadvantage of the other side, whether it will or will not restrict neutral or nonaligned countries when making decisions about their military equipment, or whether it might not mean--in the conditions of the alleged geographical East-West asymmetry--the end of the concept of forward defense, the West should respond with its own constructive counterproposals.

All the more so since on the whole we register some positive Western reaction to that appeal. Provided there exists good will on behalf of the Western countries, which after all, have always stressed the importance of the problem of reducing the number of armed forces and conventional equipment, this program could become a realistic foundation for appropriate agreements.

In the context of European affairs, I also would like to mention another highly topical issue which directly concerns our security. This is the issue of Soviet and American intermediate-range missiles in Europe. In the communique adopted in Budapest we defined our stance unequivocally. We quite clearly favored their total scrapping, with the understandable provision that neither France nor Great Britain would increase their corresponding nuclear devices. In case of such a solution, the Soviet missile complexes of operational-tactical designation would also be removed from CSSR and GDR territory.

Comrade chairman, we also attach fundamental importance to the conference's deliberations about the total ban and the scrapping of chemical weapons which, in their new forms, are gradually becoming comparable with nuclear weapons, and their proliferation and the threat to use them therefore constitute a dangerous component of strategic destabilization. The socialist states have more than once demonstrated their sincere endeavor for a definite elimination of chemical arsenals. They were and are prepared to take into consideration the security interests of all states. A telling example of that readiness is the Soviet proposals of 22 April of this year. They link organically the Soviet concept of chemical disarmament with the key demands of the Western states and are convincing evidence that it is not the issues of verification that make achieving a chemical convention or other disarmament accords impossible. These Soviet proposals, in our opinion, create the framework within the issue of the declaration [as published] of chemical weapons and projects for their production and their gradual complete liquidation could be quickly resolved.

Giving priority to the comprehensive ban on chemical weapons, we also emphasize the importance of practical partial measures, which could make the overall solution of this issue easier. Therefore, as early as 12 September of last year, we, together with the GDR Government, proposed to the FRG Government to agree on creating a zone free from chemical weapons in Europe, which would, to start with, encompass the territory of our three states, and in the next stage the whole of central Europe. On 21 May of this year we also submitted a draft of principles and main directions for such talks.

We are convinced that an agreement on creating a zone free from chemical weapons in central Europe would create genuine guarantees of security, whose significance would potentially exceed the borders of the zone. Moreover, the

agreement could also become a model for resolving problems connected with a worldwide ban on chemical weapons, including the appropriate aspects of verification. Why not take up this path, why not choose this method, since we are walking along and even calling for similar paths when resolving other problems, for example ecological or trade-economic problems? In these areas, by means of the step-by-step method, by resolving partial issues, we are moving gradually toward a comprehensive solution of problems.

In our opinion, these circumstances justify these parallel efforts for a regional limitation of chemical weapons, just as they do in the case of nuclear-free zones. They even make these efforts essential. There is in our opinion no discrepancy between these efforts and the search for a global ban on these types of weapons as they impair neither trust nor stability and do not make verification more complicated. We are ready to continue our contacts with the FRG Government and other interested states. This can also take the form of consultations between delegations at this conference, which should be aimed at finding in a constructive and responsible spirit joint solutions in the shortest possible span of time. We also support the proposal advanced by Bulgaria and Romania for a zone free of chemical weapons in the Balkans.

In complete harmony with its comprehensive approach to the issues of international security and disarmament, Czechoslovakia fully supports the idea of collecting in a single document basic disarmament measures that would ultimately lead to a general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Since 1980, we have been actively contributing to the endeavor of the conference to draft such a general program. We want the process of disarmament negotiations to be purposeful and not improvised. The set tasks of these negotiations should not be subject to the whims of one state or another but they should be clear elements of a general international disarmament strategy. That is why we fully support the basic idea that the program be divided into three stages and that its implementation be oriented toward the year 2000. We regard the drafting and implementation of such a program as realistic. However, it is necessary to fully acknowledge the fact that if this general program is to serve real progress it must inevitably include--already in its first stage--key measures toward nuclear disarmament.

Comrade chairman:

We regard as disconcerting the fact that the influence of Europe, or at least the influence of one of its parts, on the solution of the problems of disarmament has grown weaker recently. It is as though some of our partners were afraid to assume clear-cut positions and to identify their own interests. General declarations in the spirit of Atlantic solidarity about peace and freedom, stability and security, and the readiness to conduct a constructive dialogue with the states of the Warsaw Pact are not enough to bring about progress. Nor will demands, no matter how detailed, for control and verification, for transparency and trust, lead to that goal if they remain devoid of their material foundation, that is, of specific measures toward disarmament. It is this that must be the subject of negotiations in the first place. We must make a transition from the formulation of ever new obstacles, unfeasible conditions, and preliminary demands toward a businesslike, practical discussion among equal

partners. It is precisely this approach that we consider to be one of the essential features of a genuinely new mode of political thinking. The socialist states have repeatedly demonstrated that they are ready to conduct such negotiations--in Vienna, Stockholm, New York, and also here in Geneva.

As far as verification measures and the consistent observance of disarmament agreements are concerned, I would like to point out that we are not opposed to anything that sincerely pursues a single goal--to ensure their observance in keeping with the ancient legal principle of "Pacta sunt servanda" [quote in Latin as published]. That means, we are not opposed to anything that does not constitute a cleverly conceived scheme for creating conflicting situations and deliberate collisions with the sovereignty of states. He who has responsibly studied our proposals knows very well that this is the case.

Comrade chairman:

I am sufficiently aware of the gravity of the problems that I have touched upon.

Thereby I also realize what responsibility rests on the shoulders of all participants in this high negotiating forum.

After all, the question of pursuing armament or disarmament is the key to peace. It is an instrument which no one but we ourselves hold in our hands.

Surely, everyone is arming today. We, the socialist countries, and the non-socialist countries, too.

But there is a substantial difference.

In our countries it is the state that makes decisions on the production of weapons; that is, someone whose doctrine is peace, detente, and international cooperation and who is not dependent on profits from armament.

The same thing cannot be said of the military-industrial complexes, whose existence depends on profits from the production of weapons, from which also follows their resistance to the easing of tension and their interest in maintaining and stepping up tension. At times this is justified by the aggressive designs of socialism, at other times by its supremacy. Regrettably, these structures not only influence the policy of governments but frequently even determine this policy, naturally in a direction that is advantageous for them.

This is undoubtedly one of the main reasons why the promising victory of reason in Geneva was followed by irritated demonstrations of force near the coast of the Crimea and over Tripoli, by the organized hysteria over Chernobyl, and by doubts about SALT.

It is undoubtedly also one of the reasons for the absence of an adequate reply to date to the disarmament proposals made by the Soviet Union on 15 January of this year.

And it is also the reason why the dangerous foreign policy and neoglobalist ambitions of imperialist circles in the United States are the main cause of the tense international situation.

In spite of this, however, we in Czechoslovakia remain convinced that there is a realistic possibility of creating reliable security for all countries and of securing peaceful conditions for their development. We see the way toward this possibility in political means, in the joint efforts of all states.

The ban on nuclear tests, nuclear disarmament, abandonment of the militarization of space, the ban and liquidation of chemical weapons, as well as other disarmament measures could lead to the creation of a more secure peace for Europe and the world.

We view the approach to these measures as the yardstick of the degree of responsibility of those responsible for the fate of their own nations and of mankind.

This is a generous, yet also a realistic concept. Practical material measures toward disarmament under strict and effective, but also equal, control are necessary for its translation into life. It is precisely the adoption of such measures that we expect of this conference.

Allow me to assure this forum of our readiness and sincere endeavor to cooperate with all participants with a view to achieving progress, with a view to reaching real solutions of the complex issues that we are facing.

Our country, the author of the well-known Declaration on International Cooperation for the Attainment of the Goals of Disarmament, will never abandon this path.

/12766

CSO: 5200/3032

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

MOSCOW COMMENTARY ON U.S. BACTERIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

OW261313 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0200 GMT 25 Jun 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast; Yevdokimov commentary]

[Text] The U.S. press says that the Reagan administration is speeding up secret work connected with the production of bacteriological weapons. Here is a television news commentary.

[Yevdokimov] Hello, comrades. The United States gives an important place to bacteriological weapons in its military plans. Research in this field has been carried out for over 30 years. Huge complexes for the production of viruses and microbes, depots for human and animal disease pathogens are located in Wedgewood, Pine Bluff, and Fort Detrick. Pentagon specialists do not limit their activities to research. The U.S. military used this type of weapon during their adventures in Korea and Vietnam, and against Cuba and Nicaragua. Perfecting this barbaric type of weapon has continued up to today.

THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER has learned that the Pentagon has allocated over \$4 million to Jefferson College in Philadelphia to organize a special toxin research center. Its workers will study snake venom and toxins causing diseases like botulism and tetanus. The leadership of the new center is claiming that purely academic work will be carried out. That raises the legitimate question -- why does the Pentagon act as a contractor?

By the way, Jefferson College is far from being the only higher educational establishment in the United States to have been involved by the Pentagon in the production of bacteriological weapons. Similar work is being done at the University of Maryland. "MKULTRA" is the code name for the U.S. secret program for the development of bacteriological weapons. The purpose of the experiments is to control the minds of people, and paralyze their will with the aid of viruses. These plans fully meet Washington's current foreign policy course. The conclusion is obvious.

Today, the threat of biological war is just as dangerous as that of nuclear war. That is the reason why the demand to stop criminal experiments at U.S. bacteriological centers is heard ever more vigorously.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1450

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

BELGIUM GOVERNMENT COMPROMISE ON CHEMICAL ARMS VIEWED

Brussels LE SOIR in French 6 Jun 86 p 2

[Article by Guy Duplat: "Chemical Weapons: Belgian-Type Compromise at its Best"]

[Text] A monument of a Belgian-type compromise. A monster of hypocrisy, the opposition is belching forth. The parliamentary debate on chemical weapons ended Wednesday, in the House, on a text which contains any possible statement and its opposite, which says first one thing and then another, but which strengthens the government. The problem is well known. The minister of national defense, Mr de Donnea, has explained the Belgian position on chemical weapons to its NATO colleagues: "We are of course against this type of weapons. But in case of an international crisis, the Belgian government will consider the possibility of storing such weapons on its territory."

On 14 May, a Flemish socialist, Mr Chevalier, interpellated the government on this issue. Everything would have gone beautifully for Martens and consorts if a CVP deputy, Mr Uyttendaele, had not filed a motion that considerably amended that position. Indeed, it stated that "Belgium would make it clear to its NATO partners that, under no circumstance, neither in time of peace nor in time of crisis, nor in time of war will it be prepared to store chemical weapons or equip its troops with such weapons."

With time, the motion made headway. The sensitivity of Flanders to military questions is well known. The passionate debate on missiles is not that far back. In addition, Flanders remembers the gas victims of World War I. Eventually, pacifist sensibility prevailed and, last Sunday, the CVP Congress unanimously approved Mr Uyttendaele's motion.

The result was a deadlock between the government's position, "no chemical weapons except, perhaps, in case of a crisis," and the position of the CVP which stated "no chemical weapons ever."

But, in Belgium, even in a deadlock, there are always ways out. Tuesday, the leaders of the four parliamentary majority group met all day, without reaching an agreement. There were still two opposing motions. That of the PSC and PRL was "a pure and simple agenda," i.e. the House expressed its confidence to Martens without reaching a decision on the issue; and the CVP and PVV motion

which repeated Mr Uyttendaele's text. Wednesday morning, the majority group leaders, the prime minister, the vice prime ministers and the ministers of foreign relations and national defense met for 3 hours in an attempt to reconcile their points of view.

Article 68

In the final text issued from this long and difficult conclave, Mr Uyttendaele's motion is repeated almost word for word: "The Parliament," it reads, "finds that it is necessary to make it clear to our NATO partners that our country is not prepared, under any circumstance, to store binary weapons or other chemical weapons or to equip our troops with them." The only passage deleted is the one that clarified the phrase "under no circumstance" and stated "in time of peace, crisis or war." Apparently, therefore, the CVP won its case and CVP representatives hastened to say so to each and all.

But they were counting without an addition at the beginning of the text, which specified that all this was to be done "in compliance with the provisions of the Constitution." An obvious addition, but one that rendered totally meaningless any absolute refusal to place chemical weapons. Indeed, article 68 of the Constitution specifies that, in case of a conflict, the king, i.e. the government, will freely decide what has to be done and inform the parliament only afterward. According to article 68, "the king shall command the Army and the Navy, declare war, conclude peace, alliance and trade treaties. He shall inform the parliament as soon as the interest and safety of the State will permit, adding any appropriate communications."

For the liberals and the government, that is clear: the parliament expresses its opinion, but in all these matters it is the government which decides. Mr de Donnea's position, as expressed before its NATO colleagues, "is confirmed" even if it reappears under another form, which is going to be somewhat of a headache for the exegetes of the Atlantic Alliance.

Shaking Heads

This "fence-sitting" motion was voted by a full majority. In the House, the opposition did try to force the government, or the majority, to explain the meaning of "article 68" or the meaning of the apparent contradictions of the text. But without success. House rules prohibit any debate on a motion that concludes a previous debate. It must be said that this is the first time since 1976 that a motion concluding a debate was announced in extremis. But one "trick" more or less did not matter.

A last incident closed this debate in the House, beautifully illustrating all the subtleties of the compromise arrived at. Karel Van Miert, the SP chairman, went up to the tribune to ask whether Mr de Donnea would have to alter his point of view with respect to NATO. Mr Gol hastened to say "no" by shaking his head, while the prime minister, seated next to him, was nodding "yes."

9294

CSO: 5200/2707

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR SUPPORTS DPRK CALL FOR KOREAN NFZ

Foreign Ministry Statement

LD031015 Moscow TASS in English 1000 GMT 3 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 3 TASS -- Following is the full text of the statement by the Foreign Ministry of the USSR:

The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has issued a statement proposing that the Korean Peninsula be turned into a nuclear-free, peace zone. The DPRK, which recently joined the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, has now unilaterally proclaimed the renunciation of the testing, production, importation and deployment of nuclear weapons on its territory, and the prohibition of their transit via the republic's territory, air space and territorial waters.

The DPRK Government has called on the United States to stop the introduction of nuclear weapons into South Korea, to reduce stage by stage all the weapons deployed there and to give up the plans of using nuclear weapons in Korea. The DPRK's readiness was also expressed to start talks with the U.S. and South Korea on these issues.

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of this new peace initiative. It is a manifestation of the sincere striving of the leadership and the people of the DPRK towards lessening tension and strengthening peace in the Far East and throughout the world. The proposal, worked out in Pyongyang, would eliminate in the event of its consistent and full implementation a serious potential breeding ground of a nuclear conflict and would become a substantial contribution to consolidating the nuclear weapons non-proliferation regime.

The DPRK's constructive step is being viewed in the Soviet Union as logical continuation of socialist Korea's consistent peace efforts directed at achieving a withdrawal of the American troops from South Korea, replacing the armistice in Korea with a peace agreement, drafting a North-South non-attack declaration, ending the practice of conducting large-scale military exercises on the territory of the peninsula, and promoting a peace dialogue between the two parts of Korea.

The DPRK's initiative is yet another vivid example of the socialist countries' readiness for an active search for ways of nuclear disarmament so as to traverse their part of the road in resolving the problem of ensuring security in Asia.

The Foreign Ministry of the USSR declares on the Soviet leadership's instruction that the Soviet Union wholly backs the latest proposal by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Aliyev Speech

PM041225 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jul 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Excerpts] On 2 July the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and Soviet Government held a dinner in the Kremlin in honor of the party and government delegation from the DPRK headed by Kim Hwan, member of the Workers Party of Korea [WPK] Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the WPK Central Committee. The delegation has arrived in our country to participate in ceremonies devoted to the 25th anniversary of the USSR-DPRK Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance.

The Soviet side was represented by G.A. Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; I.V. Kapitonov, chairman of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission; deputy chairmen of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, leaders of a number of ministries and departments, and other officials.

Welcoming the guests, G.A. Aliyev stressed that facts and life itself confirm more vividly and with greater force ~~that~~ relations between the USSR and socialist Korea are developing fruitfully and effectively on a large multi-faceted scale.

The CPSU and the Soviet state actively and persistently support the DPRK'S vigorous and persistent struggle to ease tension on the peninsula and reunite the motherland on a peaceful democratic basis. The recent statement by the republic's government which calls for the Korean Peninsula to be turned into a nuclear-free peace zone is a reaffirmation of the DPRK'S peace-loving line. We welcome this important constructive initiative and are prepared to give all possible support to its implementation.

Our unswerving course for peace serves as convincing evidence that peace is really a socialist ideal.

However, the U.S. Administration, rejecting all peace-loving initiatives, is continuing to strive to achieve military superiority over socialism.

The Soviet Union, together with the DPRK, all the fraternal socialist states, and all the planet's peace-loving forces, G.A. Aliyev said in conclusion, will continue to act openly, honestly, vigorously, and constructively in defending and strengthening universal peace.

Official Greetings to DPRK

LD051511 Moscow TASS in English 1443 GMT 5 Jul 86

[Excerpts] Moscow July 5 TASS--The CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the USSR cordially congratulated in a telegram to Kim Il-song and Kang Song-san the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea, the Central People's Committee of the DPRK, the Administrative Council and the entire Korean people on the 25th anniversary of a treaty of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance between the USSR and the DPRK

The message reads, inter alia:

"The Soviet Union highly appreciates and constantly supports the peace initiatives of the Workers' Party and the Government of the DPRK aimed at ensuring peace and security in Korea and the Far East, at establishing a non-nuclear zone of peace in the Korean peninsula and at achieving the peaceful reunification of the country. The CPSU and the Soviet State will continue to do everything necessary to promote Soviet-Korean friendship and to ensure the further consolidation of our parties, countries and peoples in the struggle for the triumph of the cause of peace and socialism," the message reads.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1458

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

VENICE CITY COUNCIL DECLARES NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE--Venice, June 25 (AFP)--See Venice and ... live, nuclear-free. The council here has accepted a proposal from local "Greens" to declare the city, its canals and the lagoon a nuclear-free zone. The near-unanimous decision means the port is henceforth banned to ships carrying nuclear arms or waste, or nuclear-fueled like some warships. It also covers planes using Venice's Marco Polo Airport, and installation of nuclear arms on municipal territory. It is not quite pioneer in Italy though. Some 250 municipalities have now declared themselves nuclear-free. [Text] [Paris AFP in English 1239 GMT 25 Jun 86] /8309

CSO: 5200/2715

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: U.S. CANNOT USE ARMS RACE TO BANKRUPT USSR

Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 14, No 15, 1, 8 Apr 86

[Article by B. Ol'ginskiy: "Will the U.S. be Able to Achieve Bankruptcy of Our Economy?"; capitalized passages published in boldface]

[1 Apr 86 p 3]

[Text] This is not an idle question. This goal is set by certain U.S. circles when a regular spiral of the arms race is imposed on us and various barriers are introduced in the sphere of trade, economic, and scientific relations.

If One Turns to History

There were already times in the history of the Soviet State when it was challenged, when it was questioned if the land of the soviets was "to be" or "not to be." WE KNOW THAT DURING THE YEARS OF PREWAR 5-YEAR PLANS OUR PEOPLE HAVE CREATED A POWERFUL DEFENSE INDUSTRY. This has helped us in holding out in the Great Patriotic War. And when the enemy seized the most important regions in the western part of the USSR, "a miracle of relocating hundreds of gigantic plants in the east," as the English newspaper TIMES wrote, was accomplished where the Soviet people have forged the weapons of victory.

Thus, OUR VICTORY WAS ALSO A VICTORY OF THE LEADING SCIENTIFIC-TECHNICAL, DESIGN, AND ENGINEERING THOUGHT. Those who challenge us to new spirals of the arms race and expect to "undermine the USSR economically" should turn to testimonies and conclusions of their own experts. For example, to the opinion of Archibald V. Hill, a prominent English scientist and laureate of the Nobel Prize, who wrote: "The courage of the peoples of the USSR and the skill and effectiveness with which they mobilized their resources in order to repel the German attack were convincing proof of the strength and steadfastness of the Soviet system and effectiveness of the vigorous and wise state planning."

Even Nazis were compelled to give credit to the Soviet socialist system. Field Marshal Keitel, for example, acknowledged that leaders of the fascist "reich" were deeply mistaken in appraising the defense and economic possibilities of the USSR.

It is a proper time to remind about this now.

In the mortal battle against fascism our country lost a third of its national wealth.

And this bled-white and devastated country gritted its teeth and tightened its belt and CREATED ATOMIC WEAPONS, WHICH REQUIRED TREMENDOUS STRENGTH AND FUNDS, AND GAVE A REBUFF TO THE IMPERIALIST NUCLEAR BLACKMAIL. We did not break down and the "economic bankruptcy," which was predicted for us, did not happen.

Socialism has convincingly and clearly demonstrated its truly inexhaustible possibilities by achievements in the mastery of outer space. It is very important in this case that the USSR HAS CARRIED OUT ITS MISSILE PROGRAM THROUGH ITS OWN EFFORTS, which cannot be said about the United States. Here are the facts. After the war about 500 German scientists and rocket engineers headed by Werner von Braun, who became the "father of the American ballistic missile," and Arthur Rudolf, who headed the Pershing program, were moved from Germany to the United States.

But even taking the work of German scientists for America into account, the USSR was ahead of the United States. "We must steal from them, and not them from us," Werner von Braun himself commented on the ridiculous article "Did Russia Steal the Satellite Secret from the United States?" in the magazine U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT.

Before the war, and after it we were repeatedly challenged to new rounds of the arms race--increasingly more complex and more expensive. And each time the West did not conceal its expectation that our country and our people will not endure the heaviest burden of this endless race and will break down. Time went by, but the hopes of "Sovietologists" did not come true. On the contrary, RELIABLY ENSURING ITS SECURITY, THE SOVIET UNION DEVELOPED PEACEFUL ECONOMY AND RAISED THE WELL-BEING OF THE PEOPLE.

If in 1950 the industrial output of the USSR amounted to less than 30 percent of the U.S. level, then in 1960 it reached 55 percent, in 1970 it exceeded 75 percent, and now already amounts to more than 80 percent.

It is clear to everyone that progressive development of our peaceful economy was combined with strengthening of the defensive might. We had the strength and means for both.

Can the Parity be Preserved During Various Expenditures?

The U.S. military budget, which this year already amounts to an astronomical sum of \$300 billion, continues to grow rapidly. It is well known that the preparation for "star wars" presupposes creation of fantastically expensive weapon systems. Specialists believe that implementation of SOI will cost up to \$1.5 trillion.

Of course, the United States also compels us to participate in the devastating race of the latest strategic arms. The expectation of undermining our economy is based on this. It is quite obvious that the SOVIET UNION HAS TO ADOPT

ALL MEASURES SO THAT THE PARITY WHICH EXISTS WITH THE UNITED STATES TODAY IS NOT VIOLATED. Naturally, corresponding expenditures are required for this. A noteworthy "detail" is revealed precisely here: the BUDGETARY EXPENDITURES OF THE SOVIET UNION FOR DEFENSE ARE CONSIDERABLY SMALLER THAN THE AMERICAN MILITARY BUDGET. How does this come about?

All sorts of Western "radio voices" are attempting to palm off on us their own explanation concerning this: In the USSR, they say, the true expenditures for defense are much greater, they are "secretly" carried through according to other items in the budget. A malicious lie!

The fact that the DEFENSE INDUSTRY IN THE USSR, LIKE THE ENTIRE INDUSTRY, IS IN THE HANDS OF THE SOCIALIST STATE DOES NOT REQUIRE A REMINDER. THE PRICES SET BY THE STATE FOR DEFENSE PRODUCTION ARE STABLE. No one is allowed to set them too high, it is not necessary for there is no one to get rich on this.

In the United States, in the world of the capital, the situation is fundamentally different. Production of weapons serves the extraction of excess profits. That is why astonishing manipulations with prices occur.

Here is what was certified by President Reagan himself: "The Pentagon pays \$100 for a diode valued at 4 cents or \$900 for a small plastic lid." It seems that the mechanics of price formation alone explain to a considerable degree as to why given completely different expenditures for arms the Soviet Union has not allowed the United States to violate strategic parity.

But the explanation is far from being exhausted by the mechanics of prices. Another fundamental difference between the USSR and the United States consists in the fact that the U.S. Army is a mercenary one. Soldiers-"volunteers" serve for money. It is obvious to anyone that a hired army is many times more expensive. According to the data of the American press, the upkeep of personnel consumes more than half of the appropriations allocated to the U.S. Department of Defense.

The other important difference is in the nature of disposition of the armed forces. One thousand five hundred American military bases are scattered all over the world. A colossal amount is allotted for their upkeep annually.

But let us return again to the question as to who in America pays for the arms race. The popular thesis of Western propaganda is that as though the monopolies, which produce the arms and get rich on Pentagon orders, correspondingly make greater deductions to the treasury in the form of taxes on their profits. A sort of "self-financing" appears. It is indeed a shrewd manipulation. In words, of course.

But nothing of the sort happens in reality. With the growth of huge profits from the "industry of death," owing to the policy of President Reagan and those around him who advocate the flourishing of "free" capitalism and provide monopolies with enormous tax benefits, deductions to the treasury have not been increasing. The matter reaches strange occurrences. In 1981-83, for example,

128 large American corporations did not pay a cent in taxes to the state, although their profits during the period amounted to nearly \$60 billion.

During the past financial year, tax payments by ordinary Americans amounted to 83 percent of state treasury receipts, but the share of corporations was 6 percent. This is the way it is in reality.

[8 Apr 86 p 3]

[Text] Does the U.S. President Believe in His "Reference Book"?

Let us note: In expecting to undermine the Soviet economy by the arms race, the West counts on our certain "lag in latest technology." But here what is noteworthy: The talk about the Soviet Union's "technological lag" is obviously meant for uninformed people. But as far as those in power are concerned, then they are not being confused. The fundamental research by the notorious Hoover Institute "The United States in the Eighties"--President Reagan's "reference book"--contains a precise statement: "The United States no longer has the technological superiority over the Soviet Union." Moreover, SOVIET LEADERSHIP IN SOME IMPORTANT SECTORS OF THE DEFENSE INDUSTRY IS BEING NOTED IN THE UNITED STATES. In particular, "The Soviet Military Power," a pamphlet published by the Pentagon, states that the United States "has already begun to yield to the Soviet Union in the production and use of electronic-optical sensors, guidance systems, navigational hydroacoustic systems, and rocket engines." The question arises: How is this to be regarded?

Of course, Pentagon pamphlets are also intended at the same time for inflating the myth about "Soviet military threat" and thereby spurring on the arms race. Still, it seems to us, that our country is by no means lagging in the aforementioned spheres. Let us explain this.

It is no secret that latest electronics determine the possibilities of the defense industry in many respects. This is the way things stand here. In 1983, for example, the USSR purchased R23 million worth of electronic computers in France, the FRG, Italy, England, the United States, and Japan, but sold R114 million worth of them itself to dozens of countries.

John Kaiser, advisor to the U.S. President for science and technology, wrote in the WASHINGTON POST, a leading American newspaper: "I am simply astonished by the extent of ignorance of Americans in everything that concerns technical achievements of the Soviet Union. This, apparently, is natural. An endless avalanche of propaganda is hurled at Americans, persuading them that Russians are stealing American industrial and military secrets. Meanwhile, almost in all cases, when the West refused to supply Russians with specific technology of individual kinds of equipment, they developed their own versions in the end."

As if summarizing this sort of data, the reputable American magazine FOREIGN AFFAIRS states: "The achievements of Soviet technology, which can be used in the military field, have not yielded to Western achievements, and from time to time the Soviet Union has been leading."

It would seem that everything is clear. Nevertheless, the echoes of a myth about a "one-way street" have been heard in the questions of the American magazine TIME to CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M. S. Gorbachev: "The Soviet Union seeks to obtain a greater access to the perfect technology developed in the United States... If the United States will not provide a greater access to this technology, to whom do you intend to turn to in order to obtain it?"

M. S. Gorbachev noted in his replies: "WHEN SUBSTANTIATING THE INCREASE OF MILITARY ALLOCATIONS, THE TALK IN THE UNITED STATES IS ONLY ABOUT THE FANTASTIC USSR ACHIEVEMENTS IN TECHNOLOGY. BUT WHEN THEY WANT TO SUBSTANTIATE PROHIBITIVE MEASURES, WE ARE BEING DEPICTED AS A DENSE, BACKWARD VILLAGE, TO TRADE WITH WHICH, AND ALL THE MORE TO COOPERATE, WOULD MEAN TO UNDERMINE THEIR OWN 'NATIONAL SECURITY.' WHERE IS THE TRUTH HERE? WHAT IS TO BE BELIEVED?"

We Do Not Need "Star Wars"

But the truth cannot be concealed. THE SOVIET MILITARY DOCTRINE IS PARTICULARLY DEFENSIVE. The entire postwar history testifies that every first step and every new spiral of the arms race was not made by the USSR but by the United States. We always had to respond, to catch up. BUT THERE WAS NO INSTANCE WHEN AN IMPUDENT CHALLENGE BY AMERICAN MILITARISM REMAINED WITHOUT A PROPER RESPONSE. It was like this with the atomic bomb, with all kinds of missiles and warheads, with nuclear submarines, and so forth. Everything that will be urgently required once again, everything, that we will be compelled to do, will, of course, be created. Ye. P. Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, has noted that IF THE AMERICAN "STAR WARS" PROGRAM WOULD BE TECHNICALLY FEASIBLE, THEN IT WOULD BE MUCH EASIER FOR OUR COUNTRY TO DEVELOP MUCH CHEAPER AND SUFFICIENTLY EFFECTIVE MEANS FOR NEUTRALIZING IT.

Incidentally, let us note that today, in the epoch of NTR [scientific and technical revolution], not a single industrial state, regardless of how powerful and rich it is, cannot be in the lead in all fields of industry, science, and technology. A convincing proof of this is the United States. While dominating in the capitalist world as a whole, the United States seeks to join the scientific and technical experiment of West European countries. Its attention has also not been relaxed to Soviet achievements. The weekly U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT notes: "Tens of American companies are continuing to maintain ties and are conducting talks with the Soviet Litsenzintorg organization, trying to obtain licenses in promising sectors of technology."

The export of Soviet licenses grows an average of 30 percent a year. Incidentally, 2.5-fold more Soviet licenses were sold than acquired by the Soviet Union in the past 5-year plan. In all about 700 licenses were sold abroad.

Their most important buyers are Japan, France, the FRG, Great Britain, the United States, and Italy. By the way, the United States bought 34 licenses from the USSR and sold eight during the seventies.

In October 1983, WASHINGTON POST carried an article by columnist Jack Anderson who quoted and commented on a report by American experts on the benefit of scientific and technical cooperation with the USSR. Here are just a few examples:

Atomic energy: "the Russians have rendered valuable assistance to their American colleagues."

Electrometallurgy: here the "Soviet Union is a pioneer," and the United States succeeded in "achieving impressive results on the basis of Soviet data."

As regards first-rate fundamental research that is underway, which ensures a revolutionary change for the better in technique and technology, the USSR is far ahead of the United States and "Common Market" countries. It is being admitted in the West THAT THE LARGEST "PORTFOLIO OF IDEAS" IN THE WORLD IS PRECISELY IN THE SOVIET UNION. THE USSR IS AHEAD OF THE UNITED STATES ALMOST 2.5-FOLD WITH RESPECT TO THE NUMBER OF INVENTIONS. The question is only in using this potential much better, more fully, and more efficiently and to give powerful acceleration to scientific and technical progress. In a word, it is a question about realization of fundamental advantages of the socialist system.

Here it is appropriate to remind of some fundamental truths. ALL OUR NATIONAL WEALTH IS CREATED EXCLUSIVELY BY THE LABOR OF THE PEOPLE AND THEIR EFFORTS AND THRIFT. WE HAVE GREAT RESERVES HERE. Of course, the laziness, carelessness, and lack of ability, which are still encountered in work, can in no way be regarded as assets in the counteraction against the attempts to wear us out. Since we cannot yield to the U.S. and NATO pressure and violate the parity, we are forced to relax attention to other spheres of life. Clearly, satisfaction cannot be achieved, for example, by a shortage of good commodities, services... To give rise to discontent with some or other aspects of our life and to pessimism and maliciousness--this also is an aim of the policy of the militaristic circles and their propaganda.

The way out from this situation is obvious: not to hand them a "trump card" and TO WORK IN A WAY SO THAT OUR STATE WILL HAVE ENOUGH MEANS FOR ALL ITEMS OF EXPENDITURES--THIS IS A SIMPLE AND CLEAR RESPONSE TO THOSE WHO ARE ATTEMPTING TO WEAR US OUT.

WE DO NOT NEED AN ARMS RACE. WE HAVE NO NO NEED FOR "STAR WARS." WE HAVE OTHER AREAS TO APPLY OUR STRENGTH AND MEANS. BUT IF A NEW ROUND OF THIS RACE IS FORCED UPON US, WE WILL NOT GIVE IN AND NOT OVEREXERT OURSELVES.

9817

CSO: 5200/1353

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET MILITARY JOURNAL REVIEWS ARMS CONTROL POLICY

Moscow KOMMUNIST VOORUZHENNYKH SIL in Russian No 4, Feb 86 pp 15-20

[Unsigned article: "A Policy Conforming to the Aspirations of Nationalities"; text enclosed in slantlines originally in boldface]

[Text] A party congress is always an important event in the life of the Soviet state. It is also an event of lasting international significance, however. The Soviet nation is a pioneer on the path of human society's progressive development, a beacon for millions of people abroad. More and more peoples are refusing to trust capitalism, do not wish to link prospects for their development with it and are persistently drawn to the kind of social structure and the kind of social relations which have already developed in the socialist nations.

True to Lenin's principle with respect to the Marxist party's directing role in the development and implementation of the socialist state's foreign policy strategy and tactics, the CPSU, its Central Committee and the CC Politburo give daily attention to questions of foreign policy and international life. They work out and direct the foreign policy course of the USSR on the basis of in-depth Marxist-Leninist analysis of the situation in the international arena and with proper consideration for the balance of power in the world and for the natural laws and factors determining the main trends of world development and its prospects.

The Soviet state's foreign policy course is rightly called the Lenin course. V.I. Lenin's works and Communist Party documents contain a thorough elaboration of the theory of foreign policy activity and define the general line in the struggle for and the defense of peace and socialism. Every peace initiative of the Soviet Union and our every foreign policy move embody the great Lenin's behests. The Lenin peace strategy and the Lenin socialist foreign policy principles define the international activity of the CPSU and the Soviet state in the contemporary situation.

A peace offensive developed on the foreign policy front during preparations for the Communist Party congress. Speeches by Soviet leaders in the spirit of Leninist traditions and based on political realism and a sober assessment of the world situation expressed an appeal for serious and constructive dialogue on urgent international problems. Our nation's will to revive the process of detente, make it universal and establish a lasting and just peace on earth, was reaffirmed.

In the situation in the world, a situation which has grown significantly more complicated, the Soviet Union and the socialist commonwealth as a whole, while demonstrating vigilance and issuing a fitting rebuff to the intrigues of international reaction, have devoted and continue to devote particular attention to strengthening the solidarity of our ranks and to further intensifying cooperation both on a bilateral basis and through their political and defensive alliance, the Warsaw Pact Organization, as well as within the framework of CEMA. Regular meetings of the leaders of fraternal parties and nations have contributed a great deal to this process. Joint steps in the foreign policy area have been worked out and coordinated during such meetings and at sessions of the Political Consultative Committee (PCC) of the Warsaw Pact States.

The fraternal socialist nations have not succumbed to the provocations of imperialist forces and are actively pursuing a peace-loving foreign policy course in the international arena. In the process of this multifaceted and complex work, they have unvaryingly put forth the constructive, peace-loving initiatives contained in joint documents adopted by them, particularly decisions of the PCC of the Warsaw Pact States.

The role of the Soviet Union and the peace-loving socialist commonwealth is growing at the contemporary stage. Today, socialism functions as a powerful world system with an enormous influence on the development of mankind and on its future, and is an invincible factor for peace and a guarantor of the security of peoples. All of progressive mankind looks to us with hope. History itself has charged the fraternal nations with extraordinary responsibility for maintaining peace on earth and for preserving civilization itself.

Consistently pursuing a course of universal cooperation and drawing together of the socialist states, the CPSU and fraternal parties proceed from the basic commonality of their interests and from the inseparable linkage between those interests and the international tasks and objectives of the world socialist commonwealth. Relations among the fraternal socialist nations are based on the principles of socialist internationalism, which are embodied in the voluntary alliance of independent and equal socialist states and in the close cooperation and selfless mutual assistance in the common struggle to build socialism and communism.

Loyalty to socialist internationalism is an inseparable feature of Soviet foreign policy with respect to the socialist nations. This is why the undeviating expansion and intensification of cooperation between the USSR and the fraternal nations and all-out promotion of the strengthening and the progress of the world socialist system constitute the priority direction in the CPSU's international policy.

The Warsaw Pact is of lasting importance in this respect. For 30 years it has reliably served to strengthen all-around cooperation among the participants, to ensure their sovereignty, the security and inviolability of their borders, and the joint development and implementation of a peace-loving foreign policy course, and has played a prominent role in the preservation and strengthening of peace in Europe and throughout the world.

The socialist commonwealth nations hold high the banner of the struggle for peace, the struggle to preserve life on our planet. The Warsaw Pact states

counter the policy of undermining detente, of the arms race and military confrontation pursued by the USA and other NATO nations with a consistent course of strengthening peace and developing international cooperation, reducing armaments and strengthening neighborly relations.

All of the joint decisions and actions of the Warsaw Pact nations are based on precisely this course. In the '80s it has been further affirmed in documents from the conferences of the Political Consultative Committee held in Warsaw in May of 1980 and in Prague in January of 1983, at the meeting of leading party and state officials of the seven socialist states held in Moscow in June of 1983, at the economic summit conference of CEMA held in Moscow in June of 1984, at the conference of the PCC held in Sofia in October and at the meeting in Prague in November of last year.

Restraining the arms race and disarmament constitute a task of historical scope. Socialism's ideal, the draft new edition of the CPSU Program stresses, is a world without war, without weapons. The USSR and other fraternal nations are endeavoring to eliminate the threat of war emanating mainly from imperialism, which is steadily building up its military arsenals.

Eliminating the threat of a world war continues to be the main element in foreign policy actions of the CPSU and the Soviet state. Only with favorable external conditions is it possible to perfect the socialist society and advance toward communism in the USSR. In the interest of mankind, for the sake of the present and future generations of our people and all peoples on the planet, we are supporting an extensive and constructive program of measures aimed at halting the arms race and ensuring peace and security.

Imperialism, primarily American, having placed its stakes on destroying the current balance of military power between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, between the USA and the USSR, to its benefit has launched an arms race on an unprecedented scale. One after another, ruling circles of the USA advance aggressive documents for conducting nuclear war--brief or drawn-out, limited or universal. They arbitrarily declare vast regions of the world to be a "sphere of vital interests" of the USA.

The aggressive, imperial ambitions are making themselves felt in increasingly crude intervention in the affairs of other nations and peoples, in the inflaming of hotspots of tensions and conflicts and in increasing manifestations of police-like, great-power, self-assumed rule. Attempts to take weapons, including nuclear weapons, into space constitute a particular threat to mankind.

The CPSU proceeds from the premise that there are powerful forces acting in defense of peace, that greatest of common human values. The efforts of the socialist commonwealth nations and of the international communist, workers' and national liberation movements are merging into one today in the struggle for the noble ideals of peace. The wave of antiwar demonstrations in the capitalist nations is growing.

Inexorably convinced of the historical correctness of the forces of peace and trusting in their selfless preparedness to do everything possible to block imperialism's military adventures, the Soviet Union is striving to prevent a new world

war, to preserve our civilization and life on Earth. This policy is therefore meeting with understanding and support on the part of peace-loving states and of all antiwar forces.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly stated that there is no type of weapon which our nation would not be prepared to limit or reduce on a reciprocal basis. If the weapons build-up is continuing--more than that, intensifying--if the pace of the arms race is so great that it is outstripping the achievement of agreements on their limitation, if agreements already reached in this area are being placed into question, this is a result of the NATO bloc's aggressive course.

The Soviet Union has made a great effort to get talks started with the USA on nuclear and space weapons. Soviet and American representatives are presently meeting at the negotiating table in Geneva. This is a positive development.

A desire to gain from the Soviet Union concessions detrimental to its security interests can be clearly seen in the U.S. approach, however. There is no progress in the group dealing with space. Of all the strategic forces possessed by the USSR and the USA, Washington arbitrarily picks out only land-based missiles, which make up the backbone of our nation's strategic capability, and proposes engaging in a reduction of these. Those types of weapons in which the USA has superiority--submarine-based missiles, strategic bombers and cruise missiles--however, it would like to leave out of the talks.

With respect to limiting medium-range nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union proposes eliminating ground-based missiles, including those which we have had for more than 20 years. When it comes to NATO's medium-range nuclear capability, however, the American side feels that it should be retained, and it is even planned to increase this capability. The bias and the lack of logic in this position is apparent, and the Soviet Union can naturally not agree to it. It is advancing at these talks proposals which conform to the interests of equal security and the achievement of mutually acceptable agreements.

In order to make it easier to surmount the palisade of obstacles and stipulations, the Soviet Union is prepared to consider an agreement on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe separately, without linking it directly to the problem of space and strategic weapons. We propose to France and England, which also possess nuclear weapons, that a dialog be started on the European balance of nuclear forces in an attempt to find an acceptable solution through joint efforts.

It is our firm conviction that the principle of equality and equal security must be the main principle in talks on limiting the arms race and disarmament, a principle from which the Soviet Union cannot deviate. If our partners accept this basic principle, the talks will move firmly ahead. If, however, the tasks are used as a screen for the further strengthening of military muscles, the situation can only become more complicated. Neither party can count on achieving superiority to the detriment of the other's security. This is the only real logic possible in talks on such serious problems affecting the interests of peoples and the fate of universal peace. Hotspots of military conflicts have arisen in recent years in first one and then another region of the world, frequently threatening to develop into a conflagration. They are rooted in the imperial behavior of those who do not consider the legitimate interests of other nations and peoples,

attempt to intervene in their internal affairs and impose their will upon them. This is precisely the policy conducted by ruling circles of the USA. As a result, dangerous "hotspots" and conflict situations are emerging in various regions of the world, whether it be the Near East, Southwest Asia, the South Atlantic, Central America or the Caribbean Basin. It is not easy to extinguish them, and such spots must be prevented from developing. It is an extremely important area of our policy to help eliminate conflict situations.

The foreign policy work performed by the CPSU and the Soviet government throughout the period between congresses has been active, consistent and aggressive. It reached its apex during the last months of last year and the beginning of this year, however. A system of peace initiatives and steps to establish cooperation were announced during M.S. Gorbachev's visit to France. At the Geneva summit, both the USSR and the USA, acknowledging their special responsibility for preserving peace, stated that nuclear war must never be unleashed, that there could be no winners in one. Persistent efforts by the Soviet side in Geneva got the USA to confirm its intention to improve relations with the USSR and to help reduce the threat of a nuclear war, prevent a nuclear arms race in space and halt the race on earth.

/In January the CPSU and the Soviet state took a new and fundamentally important step, which opened up a real prospect for ensuring a peaceful future for mankind. CPSU CC General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev presented the Statement on Limiting the Arms Race and Disarmament/. This political document contains an extensive and specific program for totally eliminating nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction within the next 15 years--that is, by the end of the current millennium--with the condition that the creation (sozdaniye), testing and deployment of space strike weapons be rejected. Every line of the Statement is imbued with concern for the fate of peace and is dictated by the need to overcome the negative, confrontational trends, which have grown in recent years, and to establish trust as an inseparable element of relations among states.

In accordance with our proposals, the first stage of the program, which is calculated for a period of 5-8 years, would involve cutting in half the nuclear weapons of the USSR and the USA which can reach each other's territory. The parties would retain no more than 6,000 charges on the remaining carriers.

At the same time, there would be a total elimination of medium-range missiles, both ballistic and cruise, of the USSR and the USA in the European zone. In addition, the USA would not provide these kinds of missiles to other nations, and England and France would not build up their nuclear armaments.

At the very beginning it is essential for both powers to reach agreement on the halting of all nuclear explosions. The Soviet Union extended its bilateral moratorium an additional 3 months--that is, to the end of March 1986. This was clearly not an easy decision. It was the only way to actually and reliably close off the channels for perfecting nuclear weapons, however.

In the second phase, no later than 1990, the remaining nuclear powers would join in. They would first freeze and then reduce all weapons with a range of up to 1,000 kilometers. The process of eliminating nuclear weapons completely and universally should be completed in the third phase, during the period 1995-1999. The Soviet program calls also for the elimination of barbaric chemical weapons.

Speaking for the Soviet Union, M.S. Gorbachev has also proposed reducing conventional weapons and armed forces. The way to accomplish this is to reach agreement at the Conference on Measures to Strengthen Trust and Security and on Disarmament in Europe and at talks on reducing armed forces and weapons in Central Europe.

Our new proposals are addressed to the governments and peoples of all nations on all continents. They are addressed to the USA, which, together with the Soviet Union, bears the main burden of responsibility for preserving peace, and to Europe, since the flames of world war have flared up twice on that continent. They are addressed to Asia, where the residents of two cities experienced the horror of a nuclear bombing, and to Africa and Latin America, which suffer more than others from poverty and backwardness produced by the arms race.

We could have begun far earlier to cleanse our planet of the nuclear and chemical danger which threatens to destroy all life. It is not too late even now, however. And we need to begin not tomorrow but today, right now, without losing a single day. Every line of the comprehensive Soviet program for establishing peace, a program directed to all peoples and states, attempts to convince people of this. We can still reach agreement on a specific plan of practical action aimed at the total elimination of nuclear weapons. We can still prevent weapons from being placed into space. We can still eliminate stockpiles of chemical weapons and the industrial base for their production. We still have the opportunity to prevent a world catastrophe.

The program set forth in M.S. Gorbachev's Statement conforms to the interests of the Soviet Union and makes the life of the Soviet people more secure. Our people have grand plans of social and economic development for the nation. We are to almost double our economic capability within 15 years. And for this we need peace and security. Implementation of the Soviet program will benefit all peoples on the planet.

The Soviet Union believes that current international problems can be and must be resolved by peaceful means, at the negotiating table. The USSR is prepared to cooperate on a constructive basis with all the nations of Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America in a struggle for peace, a struggle to improve the situation and develop normal, good relations among states. We are for the development of equal, friendly relations with the liberated nations and for maintaining and developing relations with the capitalist states based on peaceful coexistence and mutually advantageous, practical cooperation.

Securing a lasting peace and protecting the right of peoples to independence and social progress are the unvarying goals of our foreign policy. A peaceful life has been provided for the Soviet people and for most of the planet's population for the longest period in the 20th Century precisely as a result of the peace-loving foreign policy course combined with the strengthening of the nation's defense capability. During these pre-congress days the Soviet people and fighting-men of the Armed Forces are expressing their profound gratitude to the Communist Party for its concern for preserving peace on earth and for strengthening our defense capability in the interest of protecting the homeland.

It is the great historical mission of the Soviet Armed Forces to stand up for and protect peace. We cannot relax our vigilance in the face of imperialism's aggressive preparations. In the complex international situation in which imperialist "hawks" are attempting to force peoples onto the path of hostility and military confrontation, the Communist Party and the Soviet government will continue to concern themselves with maintaining our defense capability at the proper level.

It is the duty of Soviet fightingmen to steadfastly guard the security of our homeland, of our friends and allies, and to maintain a high level of vigilance and a state of preparedness to deliver a devastating rebuff to any aggression.

COPYRIGHT: "Kommunist Vooruzhennykh Sil", 1986.

11499

CSO: 1801/172

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: UN EUROPEAN REGIONAL DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE IN TBILISI

Significance of Conference

Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian No 22, 23-29 May p 5

[Article by V. Kornilov, secretary, Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace: "A New Way of Thinking in the Nuclear Age"; first paragraph is ZA RUBEZHOM introduction]

[Text] On 19 May the work of the second UN Regional Conference held in the Soviet Union devoted to the worldwide campaign for disarmament began in Tbilisi (the first was held in 1984 in Leningrad). Since 1982, when the second special session on disarmament of the UN General Assembly announced the beginning of the worldwide campaign for disarmament, a total of 12 such meetings of the international public have been held in various countries. A distinguishing feature of the conference in Tbilisi is the fact that it is also devoted to the International Year of Peace.

The reader may wonder what this is here about the international public, since the UN is an inter-governmental organization. The UN remains an inter-governmental instrument of cooperation. However, in recent years very appreciable innovations have been noted. The UN Secretariat and its specialized institutions is more and more frequently appealing to international public opinion when solving specific tasks with request for support of its efforts, most of all in the field of preserving peace and achieving concrete results on the path of disarmament and returning to the process of detente.

The words with which the UN charter begins: "We, the peoples of the United Nations...", have begun to take on their true meaning and initial significance which the founding states invested in them over 40 years ago.

It is precisely for this reason that representative conferences of international and national non-governmental organizations began to be held under UN aegis.

Participating in the work of this conference are more than 60 delegates from 26 countries of Europe and Central America, representing 24 national organizations and movements, 19 institutes and centers for the study of

problems of peace and disarmament, a number of representatives of the mass information media, as well as delegations from 14 international and regional non-governmental organizations of various political orientation.

The main objective of this conference is to report to the international public the plans and specific actions of the UN in the field of disarmament, in its various aspects, and to make a comparative analysis of the positions of the countries of West and East with respect to their approaches to solving this most important task facing mankind. Another conference objective, posed by its main organizer, the UN Department on Disarmament Issues (in the Soviet Union the co-organizers are the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace and the Georgian Republic Committee for the Defense of Peace, with the support and assistance of the USSR MID [Ministry of Foreign Affairs]), is to listen to the opinions of non-governmental organizations on the substance of the problems being discussed and to take them into account in further practical work.

Prominent state and public figures and scholars, not only from different countries, but also holding various political views, presented reports to the conference participants on problems of nuclear disarmament; the relationship between disarmament and development; conventional arms reduction; verification of disarmament agreements and strengthening confidence and security measures.

From all this came a broad range of opinions and positions and divergent approaches and assessments of various world events and the causes of these events. At the same time, the first days of the work of the conference had already clearly shown that all its participants, whether speakers, listeners or observers, have a common conviction that nuclear war must be prevented, no matter what, and that specific, joint efforts of large and small states, political parties, public organizations and movements, scholars, doctors, parliamentarians and the UN are required, in order to escape from the period of confrontation and begin step-by-step movement toward freeing the planet from nuclear, chemical and other types of weapons of mass destruction.

Speaking about the "Spirit of Geneva," many conference participants noted that in order to implement in practice the whole complex of understandings achieved there it is now necessary as never before to be rid decisively of old stereotypes of military and political thinking, which are harmful to the cause of peace and disarmament. It is necessary to introduce into the fabric of international relations new assessments, approaches and (most importantly) action, based on the firm conviction that no one can win a nuclear war and that security in the nuclear age can only be singular, universal and equal for all large and small countries and peoples, and that the only method of solving conflicts is through political negotiations, based on the true desire of the parties to solve the particular problem.

Some conference participants, who agreed overall with this statement of the issue, at the same time expressed the thought that the new political thinking "cannot be formed from thin air, and will not come in and of itself," and that for this mutual examples, a strengthening of mutual confidence and unilateral steps toward disarmament are required.

In principle this is true, but what is behind these statements gives one pause. Do they not conceal a desire to introduce the thought that, supposedly, the Soviet Union did not declare a unilateral moratorium on all types of nuclear explosions and did not extend it, also unilaterally, until 6 August of this year, and that M. S. Gorbachev did not propose to the United States and the whole world community a program for nuclear disarmament until the year 2000, and that we did not make proposals on chemical weapons and on measures in the field of reducing conventional arms, formulated in April of this year in Berlin.

Such hushing up of the all-encompassing system of peace initiatives made by the Soviet Union, which received wide support from the peoples of the world and regenerated hopes of a peaceful future for our planet, in no way indicated desire to join in the new political thinking.

Does not official Washington's refusal to send to Tbilisi speakers invited by the UN Secretariat on the question of the non-militarization (or even ultimately the militarization!) of space and the question of nuclear disarmament also indicate this.

If the "Star Wars" program is so dear to the American administration and it has appropriate convincing arguments, then it would be necessary to send to the conference an expert on this problem. However, this did not take place. Apparently, Washington simply has no convincing public arguments in favor of "Star Wars" and the nuclear arms race.

Many conference delegates stated that joint efforts and cooperation toward the peaceful use of nuclear energy, and not separate participation in the nuclear arms race, are necessary for the cause of peace and disarmament. The Soviet movement for peace and our foreign colleagues fully share this viewpoint.

The conference is continuing until 24 May. UN Deputy General Secretary Jan Martenson (Sweden) and V. A. Ustinov (USSR), who are participating in its work, believe that the broad and representative composition of its participants and the desire of the majority to understand, and still better to cooperate, with one another, if only on some single issue, will undoubtedly contribute to the Soviet and international public in fulfilling the objectives and tasks of the worldwide campaign for disarmament and the International Year of Peace, and will give moral support to UN activity aimed at riding mankind of the threat of nuclear self-destruction.

Conference Opening

Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 20 May 86 pp 1, 3

[GRUZINFORM Article: "Toward a World Without Weapons, a World Without Wars"]

[Text] Questions pertaining to preventing nuclear war and curbing the arms race, preventing the militarization of space, and strengthening confidence and security of the peoples are at the center of attention of the UN Regional Conference which opened on 19 May in the conference hall of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

It is being held within the framework of the worldwide campaign for disarmament and the International Year of Peace. Participating in the work of the conference are representatives of authoritative international and national non-governmental organizations, including the World Peace Council, the Geneva Special Committee of non-governmental organizations for disarmament, the worldwide federation of associations for assistance to the UN, as well as prominent scholars, diplomats and public figures from the countries of Europe, the U. S. and Canada.

The conference was opened by deputy UN general secretary and chief of the department on disarmament issues, Jan Martenson, who expressed gratitude to the governments of the USSR and Soviet Georgia for inviting the conference. He stated that the fact that the regional UN Conference on disarmament issues is being held for the second time in the USSR underscores and confirms the adherence of our country to the ideals of the UN. The initiatives of the Soviet Union in the fields of peace, international security and disarmament are widely known. The worldwide campaign for disarmament proclaimed by the UN received further support here from its very outset.

Today's conference is an opportunity for open dialog and exchange of opinions on the vitally important questions of disarmament.

The goal of its participants is to learn from one another and achieve mutual understanding, for disarmament is the command of our time. Curbing the arms race is not an abstract concept; it concerns each and every one of us. In solving this problem it is very important to achieve constructive, realistic and informed public opinion. Peace is not only the absence of war. Peace is a feeling of confidence in the future. Peace is continuity, it is the future of our children and all future generations of mankind. Thus, we are doing everything so that peace will be not only a dream but a reality.

The conference participants greeted O. Ye. Cherkeziya, chairman of the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers. He expressed confidence that today's meeting of people of good will with different social views and political convictions, but united by a single desire to safeguard the earth against thermonuclear catastrophe, will become one more step toward constructive dialog and cooperation among states and peoples for peace and progress.

Based on the example of our republic and its capital, emphasized the orator, one can see for oneself the triumph of Lenin's national policy, the indestructible strength of the friendship and brotherhood of the peoples of the country of Great October, and the inexhaustible capabilities of the socialist system, which is standing in defense of the well-being, happiness and rights of Soviet man.

During the years of Soviet government, Georgia has been transformed from an economically backward outlying district of Tsarist Russia into a sovereign socialist state with developed, modern major industry, a multi-branch agriculture and advanced science and culture. Having a firm foundation of creativity, the workers of Soviet Georgia, like the entire Soviet people, are preparing to greet the 21st Century with the new, glorious achievements outlined in the historic decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress. To implement

these grand creative plans and aspirations for the future, the Soviet people, like all peoples of the planet, need peace. Mankind today has no higher or more sacred task than to struggle for peace and to prevent a new world war. It is precisely for this reason that the noble objective of the regional conference, the worldwide campaign for disarmament, like all the multi-faceted work of the UN, merit the full support of all governments and peoples, and all the world public.

Only four decades have passed since World War II, but the horrors and deprivation which it brought will never be erased from human memory. The fires of war, which encompassed 72 states, took away 55 million lives, 20 million of whom were from the Soviet Union, which even today brings profound pain to our hearts.

This sad statistic is yet another remembrance of the misfortunes with which war threatens people. At the same time it is a vivid indication of the strength of the human spirit, which is capable of unlimited heroism and self-sacrifice in the struggle for peace and against the senselessness of destruction.

It is today clear to every healthy-minded individual that it is impossible to limit nuclear war, that it cannot be waged according to previously worked out scenarios, and that it is altogether impossible to win. If unleashed in any region of the world, it will unavoidably become the detonator of a universal nuclear explosion, which will inevitably entail the death of civilization.

In this aspect the worldwide campaign for disarmament and the International Year of Peace, proclaimed by the UN, are acquiring special meaning. It is gratifying that it began in an atmosphere of optimism and hope, which arose under the influence of Geneva. The practical steps undertaken by our country are permeated with a high sense of responsibility for the destiny of peace on earth and complete solidarity with the appeal by the United Nations. We are talking about a new and constructive Peace Program, put forward in the statement by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M. S. Gorbachev on 15 January and further developed in the historic decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress. However, the unique opportunity for a warmer political climate and detente, which the moratorium on nuclear testing declared by the Soviet Union offered was not utilized. The just begun dialog between East and West, so necessary for peace, is experiencing difficult times not through our fault.

After the misfortune which took place in Chernobyl, the Soviet State again called upon the West to recognize the full importance of the historic moment and to join the moratorium on nuclear explosions which we extended until 6 August 86. We, just the same, wished to believe that reason will in the end gain victory over the forces of reaction and the spirit of militarism.

In his greetings to the conference participants, Yu. A. Zhukov, chairman of the soviet committee in defense of peace, emphasized that soviet peace advocates are actively participating in the worldwide campaign for disarmament. The week of struggle for universal security, held at the call of the World Peace Council, just concluded. In our country, more than 65 million people participated.

The Soviet people unanimously supported the proposal advanced at the 27th CPSU Congress about the bases for an all-encompassing system of international security, which harmoniously conforms with the objectives and tasks of the International Year of Peace. This concerns turning peaceful coexistence into a universal principle of inter-state relations, embodied in a constructive and creative relationship among states and peoples.

The peoples can and shall ensure that the International Year of Peace will go down in the history of mankind as the year of the beginning of creating an all-encompassing system of international security, and that each subsequent year until the end of the century becomes a landmark enroute to the complete freeing of mankind from nuclear weapons and the elimination of the threat of universal destruction. All international forums, and most of all such a universal organ of multilateral cooperation as the United Nations, are called upon to make their effective contribution in this vitally important matter. The vital cause of ensuring peace must not drown in endless verbal strife. The peoples expect that all ongoing negotiations will be effective and bring results.

There is tremendous work ahead, the goal of which is to achieve real results in the struggle for disarmament.

"The problem of disarmament and halting the arms race, especially in its nuclear aspect, is the most urgent task of our time," stated V. A. Ustinov, deputy UN general secretary and chief of the department of political affairs and matters of the Security Council, in his speech. "What is special about today's conference is that it is being held within the framework of the International Year of Peace."

The need for active and urgent actions by all states and peoples on earth to maintain and strengthen peace on our planet and prevent nuclear war is also the main content of this year. This topic is organically in accord with the basic statutory goals and tasks of the United Nations.

The official motto of the International Year of Peace, "Defend Peace and the Future of Humanity," underscores the basic objective, the creation of a more secure and peaceful future for the peoples. It would be naive to believe that it will be possible in one year to solve the many problems facing mankind. At the same time it may help to mobilize the peoples of the earth to seek their joint solution in the interest of the cause of peace.

An ever growing number of countries of different socio-economic systems are taking part in carrying out the measures of the International Year of Peace. Speaking of the Soviet Union, here mass meetings, conferences, seminars, sports competitions, etc., are being carried out and are planned. UN General Secretary Peres de Cuellar accepted with satisfaction a message from M. S. Gorbachev, stating in part: "The Soviet Union believes that the measures being planned and implemented within the framework of the International Year of Peace are called upon to contribute to the joint actions of the state and peoples, for the purpose of eliminating the military danger and mobilizing for this cause the broadest popular masses."

Proposals are coming from all ends of the earth that the International Year of Peace become a kind of new launch site for peace, directed to the 21st Century, and that it become not an episode but a lengthy process of accumulating positive elements, out of which the peoples will construct the universal building of peace.

UN Official, Dutch Delegate Interviewed

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 May 86 p 4

[Article by IZVESTIYA special correspondent I. Ivanko: "A Future Without Wars or Weapons"]

[Text] The international UN Regional Conference on Disarmament which is being held within the framework of the World Campaign for Disarmament and the International Year of Peace opened in the sessions hall of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet on 19 May. It is being attended by more than 70 participants from 25 countries. The conference participants were greeted by O. Ye. Cherkeziya, chairman of the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers.

My interlocutor is J. Martenson, UN under secretary general and head of the Department of Disarmament Affairs.

Speaking about the role of this kind of conference, I wish to say that a peaceful future cannot, of course, be ensured by conferences alone. However, this kind of exchange of views is very informative for the public and, moreover, is based on facts rather than emotions. This information helps create the political climate necessary for resolving disarmament questions. We have never denied that countries have a right to national security. I am confident that security at a much lower level can be achieved.

The subject of the so-called "nuclear winter" is now being discussed in many countries. How would an exchange of nuclear strikes affect the climate? Despite the fact that scientists express different opinions, most of them agree that mankind could be destroyed twice over: first, as a result of nuclear war itself, and second, as a result of its climatic consequences -- the "nuclear winter." This means that nuclear war must not take place: There will be no victors in a nuclear war -- something which -- and I would like to note this especially -- was confirmed at the Soviet-American summit in Geneva. This provides some grounds for optimism.

I interviewed Kh. Gerritsman, a delegate from the Netherlands.

I deal with questions of education in the spirit of peace, and so conferences of this kind are very important for me. Exchanging views here in Tbilisi, you learn a great deal about the stances of other countries and public organizations on disarmament. This enables me to relate back home how other people view a future without wars or weapons and ways of achieving it. I am very confident that the people who have come here will strive to achieve the best possible results in the cause of disseminating the UN ideas on disarmament and thus bring nearer the future without wars or weapons to which we all aspire.

20 May Proceedings

Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 21 May 86 p 3

[GRUZINFORM article: "Ensure Peace and the Future of Mankind"; first paragraph is ZARYA VOSTOKA introduction]

[Text] There is profound symbolism in the fact that the ceremonial hall of the Tbilisi Palace of Ceremonies, where usually happy events in the life of man are marked, has also become a place for holding a regional UN conference within the framework of the World Campaign for Disarmament.

The different ideologies and different positions of the people gathered here do not interfere with seeking and establishing a viewpoint which is close to or coincides with their interests. The speeches of participants on the day of the first plenary session of this representative forum were devoted to the efforts of the international community for ensuring peace on earth. Peace and only peace is the source of happiness for the present and future generations, emphasized the orators.

V. A. Ustinov, UN deputy general secretary and chief of the Security Council Department on Political Questions and Affairs, who opened the session, noted in particular that the shadow of nuclear catastrophe hangs over the life of everyone on our planet. Moreover, the arms race, which consumes substantial financial and labor resources, causing increased unemployment, is placing an ever heavier burden on the peoples. Thus, \$1 billion on weapons gives work to 28,000 people; the same sum directed into the sphere of consumer goods production provides employment for approximately 60,000 people. Thus, the problem of the arms race has not only military, but also social, economic and ecological aspects.

The World Campaign for Disarmament sets itself the noble task of making everyone understand this. Its main objective is to inform, educate and contribute to understanding and public support of United Nations' objectives in the field of arms limitations and disarmament in all regions of the world.

(Ninan Koshi), secretary of the church commission on international affairs of the World Council of Churches, talked about the significant role of religious organizations, which have multi-faceted influence in society and thereby contribute to the dissemination of information and ideas on disarmament issues.

The report by the Polish Ambassador to the USSR, (Vlodzimezh Natorf), a conference participant, expressed the opinion that the dissemination of ideological contradictions between the socialist and capitalist systems into the sphere of international relations is impermissible. Fields should be sought in which interests coincide on such global issues of our time as preventing the threat of nuclear war and eliminating "hot spots" which exist on earth.

Academician Ye. M. Primakov, director of the Institute of World Economic and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences, subjected to sharp criticism the US doctrine of neo-globalism, which is leading to increased tension in a number of regions of the planet. Nicaragua, Afghanistan, Libya and Angola represent far from a complete listing of countries where the conflict between two world outlooks is overflowing into a real and great threat to peace. It would be possible to quench the centers of military hostilities if the U. S. would cease its interference in the internal affairs of these sovereign states. This would constitute a major contribution to strengthening the security of the entire world community.

(Richard Woolcott), ambassador and permanent representative of Australia to the UN, emphasized in his report the substantial opportunities afforded by the World Campaign for Disarmament in strengthening general security. Only joint actions by authoritative international and national non-governmental organizations participating in this conference, pacifist movements, and all those who hold dear the ideals of peaceful coexistence, he stated, can ensure positive results in halting the escalation of arms.

The next plenary session of the UN Regional Conference was held on 20 May. It was devoted to the topic, "Preventing Nuclear War and Curbing the Arms Race." The first report was made by Ambassador (Danapal), the permanent representative of Sri Lanka, from the UN European Department in Geneva. The speaker noted the global nature of the problems of curbing the arms race and militarization, which reflect negatively on the processes of social and economic development of the world community.

Yu. Ye. Fokin, collegium member, USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stressed the importance of the specific proposals made by the USSR to normalize the international situation, set forth in documents of the 27th CPSU Congress and the speeches of CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M. S. Gorbachev. The speaker expressed concern that the U. S. administration to this date had not answered the soviet peace initiative.

Ambassador (Friedrich Root), FRG representative, in setting forth the well-known viewpoint of the governments of the NATO military bloc, attempted to reduce the problem of concluding appropriate agreements on questions of international security to the question of "effective verification." At the same time, he acknowledged the need to strengthen the unity of peace loving forces on questions of eliminating the race of all types of arms -- conventional, chemical, nuclear and others -- and the interrelationship between disarmament and international security.

U.S., UK Speakers

Moscow TASS in English 1913 GMT 21 May 86

[Text] The discussion continued today at the regional United Nations conference on disarmament, now in its third day in Tbilisi, the capital of Georgia (a Soviet Transcaucasian Republic).

Experts from research centers in Western and Eastern countries, invited by the Department for Disarmament Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat, spoke on such subjects as UN efforts to safeguard peace and avert nuclear war, and verification of observance of disarmament agreements.

Deputy Director of the Arms Control Association Jack Mendelsohn (United States) repeated in his speech the standard contentions by the Western mass media that the Soviet Union had supposedly concealed from the international public the circumstances of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear plant station and was too late in reporting it. From this he concluded that it was supposedly a risk to sign with the Soviet Union agreements on reductions of nuclear arms.

The chairman of the British branch of the Pugwash movement, Professor Joseph Rotblat, refuted the contentions by representatives of the United States and the FRG that the Western mass media had not used the Chernobyl accident for purposes of anti-Soviet propaganda. Professor Rotblat said that he had seen and heard everything that had been said about the Soviet Union, in particular about the alleged huge loss of life in the accident. He stressed that the USSR had done all that it could in those extreme conditions. First of all it had localized the accident in order to prevent the misfortune from spreading and immediately informed the world public -- not ten days later as it was contended by the West German delegate. The allegation that the USSR supposedly withheld information is wrong and harmful to the cause of peace, disarmament and cooperation, Joseph Rotblat stressed.

21 May Proceedings, Zhukov Interviewed

Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA 22 May 86 p 3

[GRUZINFORM article: "In the Name of Life on Earth"]

[Text] The nuclear age commands that a new approach be made to international relations and that the efforts of states of different social systems be combined in the name of halting the fatal arms race and radically improving the world political climate. The atmosphere of the regional UN conference on disarmament, which is continuing its work in the Georgian capital, is permeated with profound concern about the destiny of the planet and about ensuring stable peace on earth.

The deputy chief of the International Organizations Department, USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, D. P. Prokofyev, and the Canadian Ambassador to Austria, Michael (Shenstone), who spoke at the scheduled plenary session, as well as the participants in the discussions which took place on their reports noted that under today's conditions international security must be ensured not by military-technical but by political means. The speakers, while not diminishing the acuteness of the problem of verification of the observance of disarmament agreements, emphasized the important role of confidence building measures in relations among states.

The program for eliminating nuclear, chemical and other types of weapons of mass destruction advanced by the Soviet Union in the statement by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M. S. Gorbachev on 15 January of this year, and further developed at the 27th CPSU Congress, is assessed as a major step in this direction by broad circles of progressive world society. The President of the Geneva special committee of non-governmental organizations for disarmament, (Edith Vallantine), assessed highly the Soviet peace initiatives, stating that they warrant serious attention.

The Soviet peace loving proposals became the subject of an exchange of opinions by the conference participants, who expressed different viewpoints and views. (Werner Link), FRG representative; (Peter Stania), scientific associate of the international institute of peace in Vienna; Yelena Gavrilova, deputy chairman of the association for assistance to the UN in Bulgaria; Catholicos-Patriarch of all Georgia, Iliya II, and others spoke about variants of possible mutually acceptable solutions to the problem of disarmament. Joseph Rotblat, professor at London University and one of the creators of the British hydrogen bomb, a founder of the Pugwash movement, emphasized that the atom must serve mankind exclusively for peaceful purposes.

Increased production of intercontinental ballistic and intermediate range missiles and other types of weapons of mass destruction, holds back the social and economic progress of mankind. This was noted by the representatives of France, (Stefan Essel), and Sweden, (Inga Torsson), in their reports at the plenary session, the topic of which was "Disarmament and Development." One fifth of the annual expenditures for weapons, for example, would be sufficient so that by the year 2000 hunger on earth could be eliminated. Mankind has no other alternative -- either the arms race, which will unavoidably lead it to self destruction, or halting the arms race, which will permit systematic progress in the direction of stable and balanced socio-economic development.

The regional UN conference on disarmament is continuing its work.

At the request of a GRUZINFORM correspondent, the chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, Yu. A. Zhukov, shares his views about the nature of discussions which have developed during the conference:

"First about the participants in the conference. More than 60 delegates from 26 countries, representing 24 national organizations and movements and 19 national and international centers for the study of the problems of peace, disarmament and international relations, and a number of representatives of the foreign mass information media came to Tbilisi.

"A fruitful and, I would say, profound dialog is taking place at the meeting on the fundamental problems currently troubling world society. The first plenary sessions were devoted to discussing questions of UN efforts to secure peace, prevent nuclear war and curb the arms race, and verify the observance of disarmament agreements. Qualified experts, invited by the UN Secretariat department on disarmament, spoke on these issues.

"Of attention is the fact that, in contrast to the Leningrad regional conference, this time the U. S. government did not send a representative.

Here, in Tbilisi, the American position essentially was not set forth during the first two days. This occurred, apparently, not by accident, since Washington's position on questions of the nuclear arms race, against the background of Soviet initiatives put forth on 15 January of this year in the statement by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M. S. Gorbachev, and further developed at the 27th CPSU Congress, appear, to put it mildly, very insipid. And this became clear during the course of discussion.

"Who spoke in the role of defender of the positions of the U. S. and NATO? As was to be expected, the FRG representatives took on this role. These were most of all (Friedrich Root), state commissioner for arms control and disarmament, and Trier University professor (Werner Link). Their positions were not understood by the majority of the participants in the meeting. In this regard, the following incident attracted attention. Finally, Jack Mendelson, a U. S. representative, the deputy director of the Arms Control Association, spoke up. He could not find anything better to say than to recall the well-known fable related to the accident at Chernobyl. He repeated Western psychological warfare claims that the Soviet Union concealed from international society the circumstances of the accident, and reported on it to late. The implication of his speech was that the Soviet Union is a closed society and that it is risky to conclude a nuclear weapons control agreement with her. His speech caused sharp protests from those present. I recall the statement by the Soviet participant, chairman of the Belorussian committee for the defense of peace, Alevtina Semenova. She condemned the policy of speculation by the mass information media and Western political figures in connection with the misfortune which occurred in Chernobyl. She expressed sadness that they presented the Chernobyl incident in a false light and tried to link it with the Soviet peace initiative. The alarm bell, stated Semenova, sounded in its day in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and its alarm was repeated during accidents at nuclear power stations in the U. S., Britain and this time Chernobyl. The indifference with which Western political figures received the proposals made by M. S. Gorbachev during his recent television speech raises suspicion. It is dishonest to ignore these proposals and dishonest to drown the concern felt by world society in verbiage and diplomatic evasion. Would it not be better for us all to draw a lesson together from the Chernobyl misfortune and work jointly toward the peaceful and safe use of atomic energy for the benefit of mankind?

"Joseph Rotblat, the British scientist and founder of the Pugwash movement, refuted the words of the American delegate and the FRG representative, who asserted that the Western information media did not try to use the Chernobyl incident for the purpose of anti-Soviet propaganda. What was left unsaid about the Soviet Union and about tremendous numbers of victims of the accident? Rotblat emphasized that the USSR did everything that could be done under these extreme conditions. First of all the USSR localized the accident in order that the misfortune not spread. And as soon as reliable information was obtained about the situation the Soviet people and international society were immediately informed. To assert that the USSR hushed up information is incorrect and harmful to the cause of peace, disarmament and cooperation.

"It can already be said with confidence that the dialog which has taken place at the conference will be useful to its participants. USSR representatives are taking the most active part in the work of the conference.

"Many of the foreign participants in the conference are in the USSR, and in particular Georgia, for the first time. They are using literally every free minute to become acquainted with Tbilisi. The guests unanimously express delight at the hospitality of the Georgian people and note the well organized work of the conference itself.

"The fact that the opening of the conference was held in the conference hall of the republic Supreme Soviet and that O. Ye. Cherkeziya, chairman of the Council of Ministers, Georgian SSR, extended greetings to the conference, made a great impression on many participants. They see in this a display of the great respect which the USSR and Soviet Georgia have toward the United Nations.

"I am confident that the conference participants will leave our country taking with them the very best impressions about the Georgian people and about its ability to organize major international forums. All the guests expressed delight with the grand ceremonial palace in which we are working.

"In conclusion I wish to note the active participation in our movement by the Georgian peace advocates. The week of struggle for world security which recently concluded in our country also graphically demonstrated this."

Local Official Sees UN Aides

Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 23 May 86 p 2

[GRUZINFORM article: "Meeting in the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] On 22 May P. G. Gilashvili, chairman, Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, received Jan Martenson, United Nations deputy general secretary and chief of the department on disarmament issues, and V. A. Ustinov, chief of the department on political questions and affairs of the Security Council. They are taking part in the regional UN conference taking place in Tbilisi within the framework of the world campaign for disarmament.

Warmly greeting his guests, P. G. Gilashvili wished them success in their noble activity. He noted that the Soviet Union greatly values the efforts of the UN in preventing a nuclear catastrophe, and for world disarmament and achieving a stable peace on the planet. In this regard he emphasized the importance of today's conference as a forum for informing the world public at large about the fatal consequences of the arms race and for achieving better mutual understanding among peoples. Peace must be not only a dream, but also a reality for mankind.

Jan Martenson and V. A. Ustinov discussed the course of the work of the conference and the very important problems of our time which are being discussed there. It was noted that the tension in the international situation which has taken shape is a cause of serious concern to the world community.

In today's world every minute thousands of children are perishing from wars, hunger and deprivations. At the same time, during that same minute millions of dollars are being spent on arms. These funds, of course, should be used to solve the vital humanitarian problems of mankind. The efforts of the UN are also directed at this today as a first priority.

The guests noted the cordial and hearty welcome afforded the conference participants in Georgia.

22 May Proceedings

Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 23 May 86 p 2

[GRUZINFORM article: "Peace Based on Trust and Cooperation"]

[Text] Disarmament without verification is impossible, but verification without disarmament is also senseless. Therefore, a logical and obvious stage of the discussions at the UN regional conference on disarmament taking place in Tbilisi was a discussion of confidence building measures among states. They are of great importance in establishing and consolidating international security and the security of every state. This also serves to extend the detente process and create a more favorable climate for disarmament.

Former Indian minister of external affairs, (Macharadzhakrishna Rasgotra); Finland's deputy minister of foreign affairs, (Klaus Tornudd); V. V. Zhurkin, deputy director, Institute of the USA and Canada, USSR Academy of Sciences and corresponding member, USSR Academy of Sciences and FRG state commissioner for arms control and disarmament, (Friedrich Root), speaking about measures to strengthen confidence and security, emphasized the importance of this aspect for the process of detente and cooperation in the name of peace. The speakers noted the need to develop further positive aspects in establishing a climate of mutual trust. In particular, the Final Act of the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe regulated the procedure for taking additional steps to strengthen confidence among states. Prior notification about major military exercises, exchanges of observers and other measures entered the practice of international relations of the European countries. This experience, the speakers indicated, must serve as an example for other regions and continents.

(Serge Vurgast) (France); (Ake Viberg) (Sweden); Yuliya Zakhariyeva (Bulgaria) and other participants in the discussion discussed a wide range of problems related to confidence building measures. The majority of the speakers recognized as unfounded the attempts made by some speakers to link the incident in Chernobyl with a "crisis of confidence" toward Soviet peace initiatives, which is spoken about in the West. Undoubtedly, it was recognized at the conference, confidence building measures must not harm the national security of states. However, each step, even small step, in establishing mutual understanding must be greeted and supported on a mutual basis.

Conventional arms reductions give broad scope to strengthening peace based on trust and cooperation. This was the topic of reports by (Slavomir Dabrov)

(Poland), (Piter Folten) (Netherlands) and the representatives of other countries who discussed paths to a stable peace.

Concluding Session

Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 24 May 86 p 3

[GRUZINFORM article: "Multiply the Forces of Peace and Progress"]

[Text] In Tbilisi the work of the UN regional conference within the framework of the world campaign for disarmament has concluded.

The results of the discussions held in its three working groups were summed up on the final day in the work of the conference.

The leader of the group which discussed the topic, "The International Year of Peace: Indoctrination in the Spirit of Peace," official of the UN Security Council Department on Political Issues and Affairs, (Carlos Casap), reported that the discussion participants came to a unanimous opinion on the need to carry out extensive educational work to explain the goals and tasks of the struggle for peace and the prevention of war. The mass information media, youth and women's movements, and religious organizations can and must play an important role in this noble cause.

The session emphasized the need to disseminate correct information about life in other countries and regions and destroy the barriers of alienation and fear sown by false stereotypes of the "image of the enemy." This work must be carried out in all training institutions, and most of all in general educational schools. After all, today's children tomorrow will be the leaders of states and the world. In this regard, the tradition of conducting lessons of peace in the USSR was given a high assessment.

The members of the working group unanimously proposed discussing at the next UN General Assembly session the question of extending the International Year of Peace and accepting a peace plan extending until the year 2000.

The problems of disarmament in the field of nuclear weapons were discussed in the second working group. Its leader, a special advisor to the UN general secretary, (Prvoslav Davinich), emphasized that despite all the existing differences in the approach to the problems of nuclear disarmament the discussion participants were unified in the opinion that a real threat of catastrophe hangs over the world. In this situation, non-governmental organizations and research institutes involved in the questions of disarmament can play an important role in forming public opinion aimed at successfully solving the problems of reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons in negotiations at the state level.

The United Nations, which has the function of being the connecting link in all initiatives which serve the cause of peace and international security, can do a great deal in the campaign for nuclear disarmament. In particular, the UN could successfully fulfill the role of mediator at the most important inter-state negotiations on disarmament on the basis of reciprocity and trust.

The exchange of opinions was informal and useful. It indicated that the problems of nuclear disarmament truly concern each and every individual and must be solved constructively and without delay.

Discussion of the problems of disarmament in the field of conventional weapons in the third working group were closely interwoven with discussions at the plenary sessions at the conference. The leader of this group, (Andzhela Knippenberg), a political official of the UN department on disarmament questions, reported that the participants in the discussions started from one main premise, that in today's world, over saturated with weapons, there can be no security for any country. Security can only be mutual and universal.

It was noted that despite the lack of progress in disarmament negotiations, especially in Vienna, they must not be halted. The need to cease development of new types of weapons and establish reliable control over weapons reductions was particularly emphasized. Participants in the session, going beyond the framework of the problems under discussion, expressed with particular sharpness the need for the most rapid elimination of chemical weapons.

UN deputy general secretary and chief of the department on questions of disarmament, Jan Martenson, spoke at the close of the conference.

"Regional UN conferences within the framework of the world campaign for disarmament," he stated, "are an opportunity for a constructive exchange of opinions, expansion of dialog and improvement of mutual understanding among peoples. The role of non-governmental organizations participating in them is very important for informing the world public at large about the danger and the fatal consequences of the arms race.

"Stemming from this, I can say that the goals of this conference in Tbilisi have been successfully achieved. The speakers and participants in the discussions held a frank dialog in an atmosphere of friendliness. However, this does not mean that there were no differences of opinion. This indicates varying views about the paths to disarmament which exist in different countries. Therefore, we consider it important to disseminate balanced and objective information.

"Annually \$900 billion are spent on the arms race on our planet. This is equal to the foreign indebtedness of the developing countries. The economic consequences of the arms race are hunger, poverty, sickness and backwardness. That is why so much attention was devoted in the conference agenda to questions of the relationship between the arms race and development.

"It is especially necessary to note the importance of the problem discussed concerning limiting nuclear weapons. These are qualitatively new types of weapons. Their stockpiling in tremendous quantities places mankind in a critical position. A clear and apparent threat of worldwide catastrophe arises before us. That is why it is so necessary to achieve progress in negotiations on the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

"The UN is an organization devoted to the cause of peace and security of the peoples of the planet and must help strengthen confidence and improve the political climate, which will facilitate the success of disarmament negotiations. The UN is an extremely important mechanism for achieving understanding and agreement in solving all the urgent problems of mankind.

"Closing the conference," stated Jan Martenson, "I would like to express our deep and sincere gratitude to the Soviet Union and Soviet Georgia, and to the residents of the beautiful and ancient city of Tbilisi, for their cordial reception and hospitality. Their support greatly facilitated the effectiveness of our work. We greatly appreciate the attention afforded the conference by the government of Georgia. I also wish to express gratitude for assistance in organizing the conference to the leaders and members of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace and their Georgian colleagues."

9069

CSO: 5200/1426

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET MARSHAL: 'ARMS RACE WILL NOT DEFEAT US'

BK181041 Hanoi Domestic Service in Vietnamese 1430 GMT 17 Jun 86

[Article by Marshal Kurkotkin, USSR Deputy Minister of Defense, on 45th Anniversary of the Start of the Soviet People's Great Patriotic War]

[Text] The victory of the Soviet Union in the war--the 45th anniversary of which is being commemorated by us--affirmed that no force in the world can destroy or even check the advance of socialism. It was certainly no accident that the Soviet state should emerge as the force able to mobilize all its material and human resources to defend the country and save other nations in the world from the scourge of fascism.

However, that victory of the Soviet armed forces was not simply a victory of one army in a test of strength with another army. It was the victory of a new social regime and a socialist economy over the capitalist system and capitalist economy, and a victory of the Marxist-Leninist ideological system over the racist ideological system of fascism.

The foundations of the victory were affirmed in the great economic and social achievements of the nation and the profound reforms enforced by the Soviet administration over the years--such as socialist industrialization, agricultural collectivization, and cultural revolution--which made it possible for the Soviet army and navy to engage successfully in battles against the fascist aggressors.

It can be said that during the years of war, the Soviet Union produced a volume of war means and technologies far beyond the annual average output of Germany. Moreover, Soviet weapons also outperformed those manufactured by other countries in terms of both combat quality and efficiency.

Naturally, the world has changed in the post-war years. The Soviet Union itself has undergone a transformation beyond expectation and has become prosperous and powerful in all fields. The achievements of the Soviet Union in the economic, scientific, and technological fields have provided its armed forces with everything they need to ensure the security of their own country as well as the security of other friendly countries. As pointed out in the political report at the 27th CPSU Congress, the Soviet Union must maintain its national defense strength at a permissible level to firmly defend the peaceful work and life of its people.

Here we must pay great attention to one fact: the warlike nature of imperialism remains unchanged. Immediately after the fall of fascism and militarism in 1945, while the prospect of building a world free from war was seemingly being opened, the entire system of imperialism initiated the race for nuclear and other weapons with the ambition of driving socialism--the Soviet Union--into the most disadvantageous diplomatic situation. The nature of imperialism, especially U.S. imperialism, and its maneuvers have driven mankind toward a threshold beyond which events could develop without control and beyond expectation.

It is totally clear that the so-called Strategic Defense Initiatives program, which involves space-based offensive weapons and which calls for the perfection of the U.S. strategic offensive forces, is being carried out in order to create the capability of dealing a preemptive blow to cripple the Soviet Union without suffering from the counterblows of the Soviet strategic nuclear forces.

The United States has calculated that it will not be punished for its adventurous acts. However, it must be said frankly that there are no grounds for such illusions. Just as CPSU General Secretary Gorbachev so rightly stated during a meeting with workers in Togliatti City: It is time to abandon the idea of establishing relations with the Soviet Union on the basis of erroneous figures and illusions.

One of the most dangerous such illusions is that Soviet proposals and appeals for peace have been considered a sign of weakness. Here is the answer: The arms race will not be able to defeat us. Never hope to use the outer space to threaten anybody, nor expect to outdo anybody in industry. As a representative of the armed forces, I can assert that the Soviet Union will allow no one to force it into an off-guard situation and in case of need it will always know the proper answer to cope with all the circumstances. However, the Soviet Union opposes such an option, the irrational logic of armed buildup.

The struggle to put an end to the arms race, to prevent the arms race from spreading to outer space, and to eradicate all nuclear weapons and other mass destruction weapons by the end of this century was asserted at the 27th CPSU Congress as the central guideline of Soviet foreign policy.

The Soviet Union, which maintains the validity of all its proposals for eradicating nuclear weapons and eliminating all forms of arms race, has put forward a proposal concerning the armed forces permanently stationed in Europe. Gorbachev recently said in Berlin: The Soviet Union proposes that an agreement should be reached on the process of considerably reducing the armed services in the armies and strategic air forces of European countries as well as equivalent U.S. and Canadian forces now stationed in Europe.

This calls for a reduction in troops of all sides deployed from the Atlantic to the urals under necessary supervision and control including on-the-spot surveys. This is clearly a proposal which can improve the international situation and save European nations from the fear of becoming World War III victims.

To sum up, the Soviet Union as well as all countries of the socialist community agree to holding talks with a constructive attitude about all issues on the basis of equal security. It should also be stressed that they will not sacrifice their own security and will not allow the United States and NATO bloc to gain military superiority over the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty member countries.

The Soviet armed forces, in close alliance with the armies of fraternal countries, will remain constantly vigilant and ready to cool all warmongers'. This is essential to the peace and security of their country, allies and friends, and to the future of all nations on earth.

/12913

CSO: 5200/1453

END